*The* QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLI FEBRUARY 1955 NUMBER 1

# VIEWS ON THE ARMY-McCARTHY HEARINGS

Frederick W. Haberman

*with the assistance of*

Jonathan W. Curvin, Benjamin Wham, Ordean G. Ness, Orville A. Hitchcock, and Ben Park

I

THE statistics of the Army-McCarthy hearings are impressive: 36 days in session, 2,000,000 words uttered, 7300 pages of transcript, untold millions of words printed in newspapers and magazines, 20,000,000 television viewers and additional millions of radio listeners enthralled, and almost a million dollars worth of direct costs spent in producing the broadcasts. The effects were startling. Across the land the telephones were remarkably silent while the hearings were in session; sales of handbooks on parliamentary procedure rose; ordinarily calm people went on emotional binges in their living rooms, directing audible cheers or even destructive kicks at the hapless TV tube. In the beginning, there was abroad in the nation a feeling of wonderment occasioned by the unaccustomed intimacy with the most publicized political personalities of our time engaged in personal and constitutional struggle. Wonderment gave way to increasing confidence: the people discoursed freely on questions of procedure, on technicalities of law, on the tactics of persuasive presentation, on the adjudication of constitutional disputes.

Certain aspects of the hearings they mentioned time and again.

The aspects which stand out boldly and are of great interest to professional students of speech are those explored in this symposium. It was remarked a thousand times, for example, that the hearings were like a drama. Professor Jonathan W. Curvin, specialist in drama and Associate Director of the University of Wisconsin Theatre, analyzes these theatrical implications. What did the evidence add up to? Mr. Benjamin Wham, distinguished member of the Illinois Bar, Vice-Chairman of the Chicago Crime Commission, and member of the Chicago firm of Wham, Welch, Metzdorf and McKee, brings the lawyer's outlook to his study of the evidence presented in the hearings. The charges themselves need attention. Pro-

*Frederick W. Haberman (Ph.D., Cornell, 1947) is Professor of Speech at the University of Wisconsin.*

fessor Ordean G. Ness of The Pennsylvania State University, who served two years as a Personnel Policy Officer and Public Relations Consultant in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower, deals with the accusations by the Army. Professor Orville A. Hitchcock of The State University of Iowa, authority in debate and rhetorical theory, frequent moderator of Town Meeting of the Air, and former Executive Secretary of the Speech Association of America, assesses McCarthy's answer. Finally, there is TV itself. Mr. Ben Park, Networks Program Manager, Central Division of the National Broadcasting Company, a writer, producer, and performer, closes the symposium with some remarks on the televising of the hearings.

## II

## THE HEARINGS AS "THEATRE"

Jonathan W. Curvin

The theatre during its long history has enriched more than man's spirit. It has also enriched his vocabulary. A source of entertainment, it has been, too, a kind of dictionary, a storehouse of metaphors, a wellspring of clichés.

No recent public event has inspired such wholesale use of the theatre dictionary as the Army-McCarthy hearings. Before the gavel banged down for the opening session the press had issued advance notices headed, "The cast of characters . . . ," and "Leading men for the big show. . . ." Conservative political writers sprinkled their columns with phrases ordinarily found on the theatre page. Arthur Krock of *The New York Times* referred to "high drama," and "the elements of a good play"; he even struck a competitive note by asserting, as the hearings began, that "the actors are playing their parts better than in the theatre." Participants themselves made frequent raids on the verbal resources of the theatre or kindred arts. Senator McCarthy recklessly borrowed the terms "circus" and "vaudeville show." Attorney Welch defended his manner of questioning Mr. Cohn by saying, with more pride than apology in his voice, "I just like to be dramatic." The word *theatrical* did double duty. Sometimes it would connote a colorful, spirited contest, and sometimes a cheap, tawdry sham. So attuned to theatre imagery had we become by the final day, that we would have been disappointed had not somebody rounded off the metaphor. The Senator from Michigan obliged: he spoke of a lowering curtain. Whereupon Mr. Jenkins delivered a curtain speech: ". . . it will be easy and it will be heart-warming [he said] from day to day and from month to month and from year to year to recreate the scenes of this drama and of the characters of its cast."

As we come now to view the hearings in retrospect, words like *performer, dramatic,* and *stage* persist, not simply as facetious or picturesque figures of speech. On the contrary, each seems a *mot juste*. For the hearings, while they may or may not have given us "theatre" of a singularly compelling kind, did provide grounds for an exceptionally close analogy to what we understand by theatre.

In developing this analogy we may reverse the normal order of considering first the play's script and then its realization onstage. As we shall see presently, the hearings did produce a dramatic literature of sorts, but this literature

evolved with the "performance," the publicly conducted investigation of charges and countercharges.

Certain aspects of this performance call to mind the formal production style of classic theatre. The hearing, as its name suggests, appeals to the ear more than the eye. Except when the camera focused narrowly upon a face, letting us read there what we would, visual stimuli were wanting. The Senate Caucus Room furnished a unified, unchanging setting, its areas of action rigidly defined: one for the Chairman, independent counsel, and committee members, each committee member being identifiable as to political party by his place to the Chairman's left or right; a second area, that of the witness chair; and a third, a kind of purgatorial middle place, for Mr. Cohn and the Junior Senator from Wisconsin. Although limiting the physical movement, this setting had admirable coherence and served always to picture and reinforce the major conflicts. (We can appreciate how right the dispositions were by imagining their being altered—for example, by placing Senator McClellan between Senators Dworshak and Dirksen.)

If unity of place and symbolic locales remind us of a formal theatre, so also may certain conventions which governed the performance. There were the Committee's "ground rules," dictating procedures that were to become set and anticipatable. First came the examination of the witness by Mr. Jenkins; next by the Chairman; and finally by each member of the Committee and counsels for respective sides through ten-minute relays. Another convention limited the time for each meeting. One should note in passing the convention of the omnipresent microphone. Each voice heard was a voice amplified and to some degree thereby artificial and formalized. Even the most colloquial remarks were exchanged "on mike." As the actors of ancient Greece depended on mask and cothurnus, so the hearing participants relied on their microphones.

Their resemblance to actors did not stop here. Obliged to project an image of his character upon a great audience, each leading figure in the controversy cast himself as hero. One might have preferred more balanced casting, for this public stage at times seemed quite crowded with heroes, most of them self-acknowledged. The hearings provided many entertaining specimens of the mimic art, as well as some transparent overacting. It might, however, be argued that if a dishonest man is given the opportunity to imitate an honest one over a period of time, or a man barren of thought to imitate a profound man, or an arrogant man to imitate one meek and conciliatory, the act of imitation, however badly done, may have a therapeutic value. Without exception all the actors did achieve that which the most skillful professionals re-enacting their roles might strive for in vain: the sustained tension of "the first time." And because this in fact *was* the first performance, it registered a special impact upon its audiences.

What now may be said of these audiences, the twenty millions at TV screens and radios, and over two thousand each day in the Caucus Room? Their presence, more than anything else, supports our analogy between hearings and theatre. In mordant contrast stand the subsequent "closed" hearings of the Watkins Committee. Immediately the decision was made to ventilate the Army-McCarthy dispute in public, we were assured, in Sarcey's famous phrase, of the "necessary condition" of drama. The audiences gathered from who can tell what motives: seeking "pleasure," it

may be, or "profit," or both; expecting to be moved to pity or terror, or to be roused to laughter; idly curious, or already convinced and seeking vindication; or, as seems most likely, drawn to the hearings as to a play by the fascinating prospect of watching human conflict from a comfortably safe distance.

This distance lessened as the hearings progressed. One is reminded of a mystery play whose author introduced a novel "twist." Omitting that traditional last-scene speech in which the detective summarizes his deductions and identifies the guilty, that mystery play invited the members of the audience to judge, on the basis of the evidence, the guilt or innocence of the accused. In short, the audience was supposed to play the drama's decisive role.

Similarly flattered, the audiences of the hearings, assigned roles as members of "the great American jury," came to realize that they were themselves vital performers, eventually to be responsible for the denouement. To be sure, those members of the jury-audience who were present in the Caucus Room suffered restraints not usual in the playhouse. Instructed to make "no audible manifestations of approval or disapproval," warned that policemen, both uniformed and in plainclothes, lurked in their midst, they had to forego the pleasures of violent expression which the unseen audience so enjoyed. Yet all segments of this audience were linked by their common awareness of the part they were playing in the performance, and might continue to play after it was over.

The performance lasted 36 days. It spawned a playscript (or transcript) 7300 pages long and containing 2,000,000 words of recorded speech. Here, we would say, is a script that needs cutting. Its speeches lack economy, direction, and at times even sense. It is a drama most difficult to define and requiring some fortitude to read.

Still, through the maundering improvisation runs the stuff of drama. We detect in the alternating questions and answers a pattern of dramatic dialogue. Oedipus, determined to learn the truth about his own past, quizzes the shepherd. Question, answer, question, answer, until at length the story's fragments fit together as a whole. In like manner the committee members quizzed Secretary and Senator—without, it is true, a Sophoclean preciseness, but to the same kind of purpose.

Some would attempt to define the hearings as tragedy or comedy or farce or morality play or, recalling the cropped photograph, the purloined document, and the monitored telephone calls, as spy melodrama. Possibly the hearings fit no one of these categories, but instead as a unique genre partake of them all. An "artistic imitation" they manifestly were not. Nor did they qualify as tragedy or comedy in the classic sense. Even if for our times tragic, they showed action which, though serious, was incomplete; produced in language embellished with jargon; and arousing in the audiences emotions more mixed than Aristotle recommended. As comedy the proceedings did at times reveal the ludicrous shortcomings of men of "inferior moral bent," but these shortcomings were neither "painless" nor "harmless to others." Granted the hearings had a clear beginning, their middle was indefinite and their end inconclusive. They lacked a good play's disciplined arrangement. But they did share the drama's power of generalization, the power to suggest wider implications while entertaining us with a particular fiction.

The hearings brought to light far more than the particular plot of a par-

ticular fable about a particular Army private. The Schine story, like a stone tossed in a pool, created on the surface a number of ever-widening circles. Our attention, diverted from the stone, came in time to focus upon these circles, the larger meanings: of "McCarthyism"; of the struggles between political parties and divisions of our government; of the threats to our safety from without and our freedoms from within. It would be hard to conceive of more effective means of compelling the public both to attend and to deliberate upon these matters. This was the real achievement of the hearings as "theatre."

On the opening day the Chairman announced "the effort to reveal that which is true and to expose that which is false." On the closing day the whole truth did not appear complete. "Somebody was lying," was Senator Potter's epilogue, leaving us as uncertain as he who that "somebody" was. Even a hack playwright would have more satisfactorily resolved his plot.

In the course of the hearings we of the audience may have blinked certain facts partly because, as in a theatre, we were so amenable to illusions. Mr. Welch marked with piquant frankness the illusions which we created about his performance. "There were many times," he said, "when I sat stunned and speechless, and you said, 'What patience the man has!' When I sat in an agony of indecision, you said, 'How wise he is!' Sometimes I was so weary my mind was almost a blank, and then some of you would say, 'How witty he is!' "

And now that the hearings are over, we know how impermanent their drama was. Theirs is the drama of history, of the record, of the past, incapable, we hope, of exact revival. Whereas the theatre's drama at its best may have miraculous life for all time. It may forever glory in the present tense. Senator McCarthy *spoke*. Hamlet *speaks*.

We shall not therefore say that the hearings constituted durable and deathless drama. Ephemeral though they were, they did nevertheless mirror for a time the dark forms and pressures of this investigative age.

Our contemporary theatres have done no more than this—and rarely, it could be added, have they done as much or as well.

## III

## MATERIAL, RELEVANT, COMPETENT: AND VICE VERSA

Benjamin Wham

Lawyers are popularly supposed to deal in technicalities such as the admissibility of evidence. This no doubt explains the subject assigned to me. However, may I point out that there are two types of legal mind, one technical and inclined to exclude evidence, the other less technical and inclined to admit evidence. And may I also say that this distinction is not important here because the Committee admitted most of the available evidence.

The same difference exists in the view taken of the issues involved in a controversy. Technical lawyers will tend to stick to the charges as stated by the parties, while others will tend to look beyond the narrow issues. As I belong to the latter group, let us first look briefly at the issues and some of the evidence, and then attempt to place the matter in perspective.

Thus we find that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the

Senate Committee on Government Operations under the Chairmanship of Senator McCarthy had been investigating Communists in the Army for several months and was in late 1953 engaged in investigating Communism at Fort Monmouth. There was a division in the press and among radio-television commentators which became sharper in the winter of 1954, and suddenly dominated front pages and air waves when on March 8th the Army released its Chronological Series of Events and on April 13th filed its formal charge that undue pressure had been used to obtain preferential treatment for David Schine. This caused Senator McCarthy to file for himself and staff a denial and a countercharge that the Army charge was made in bad faith and was designed to deter the work of the Committee.

The hearing resembled a three-ring circus, and the fashion seemed to be to speak at the top of one's voice, or as Mark Twain is reputed to have said, "Everyone lowered his voice to a loud scream." Mr. Jenkins performed the unusual task of first conducting a direct examination of witnesses in a friendly, solicitous manner, and then undergoing a Dr. Jekyl-Mr. Hyde transformation and conducting a stiff cross-examination. Other counsel seemed to try for a laugh at every line. Thus I think we may conclude that this hearing differed greatly from most of the congressional and court hearings. The Medina court hearing of the eleven top Communists is perhaps nearest to it in view of the confusion caused by the studied attempts by the Communists and their counsel to upset the court; and also in view of the fact that both sides in that trial were permitted almost unlimited cross-examination.

Throughout the hearing there was a regular refrain which involved a number of issues and alternated in favor of one side and then the other:

Thus on the one side Schine was of *great* value to the Committee. On the other, Schine was of *no* value to the Committee.

On the one side, the bobtailed picture of Schine and Stevens was merely *cut down* the better to show Schine and Stevens. On the other, it was *fraudulent*.

On the one side, General Zwicker was an *obstinate, unwilling* witness. On the other, the Senator, an ex-marine officer, satisfied a long pent-up desire *to tell off* the General.

On the one side, the promotion and honorable discharge of Peress was a *disgrace*. On the other, the Army simply made *an honest mistake* as to Peress.

On the one side, the possession of the abbreviated copy of the FBI document was *illegal*. On the other, it showed the *need* for congressional investigations.

On the one side, it is contrary to public interest for congressional committees to receive classified material and hear executive department employees. On the other, presidential directives prevent the committees from performing their functions and may protect Communists and so are against public interest.

On the one side, it is *illegal* to ask executive department employees to give secret information to the Committee. On the other, it is *necessary* for the Committee to obtain such information for the protection of the country.

And so it went day after day—raucous, redundant, repetitious. But out of the clatter and din there slowly emerged a glimmer of possible motives and objectives.

Cumulative evidence is found of the Army's objective to call off the Committee's investigation of the Army. At the first hearing of witnesses, October 12, 1953, Mr. John G. Adams, Army counsel, listened in and later said that the Army had all of the information the Committee had and therefore should handle the investigation. At luncheon the following day Secretary Stevens objected to the character of news emanating from the hearing which intimated the existence of espionage at Fort Mon-

mouth, and Mr. Adams asked Senator McCarthy whether there was something that they could do to bring the hearings to an end. At other luncheons, dinners, and conferences there was a regular recurrence of the refrain of letting the Army take over the investigation. There was also the suggestion that the investigation be broadened to include the Navy and Air Force in order to take the spotlight off the Army.

General Lawton, formerly commanding general at Fort Monmouth, testified that for several years he had tried without avail to deal with security risks at Fort Monmouth, but that recently he had been able to accomplish a great deal, implying that the Committee's investigation had been the reason. Thereafter General Lawton was removed from his command. Stevens denied that this removal had any connection with the committee hearings but there was evidence in statements by Mr. Adams which connected the two and at subsequent Senate hearings a gag was placed on General Lawton.

In the Peress case, Senator McCarthy had given Mr. Adams several months in which to clear up Peress' refusal to fill out a questionnaire showing what, if any, relationship he had to the Communist Party. During this period Peress was promoted to major. Senator McCarthy then subpoenaed him to appear before the Committee January 30, 1954. At the hearing Peress invoked the Fifth Amendment. Thereupon the Senator insisted that he be court-martialed, but instead on February 2nd Peress was honorably discharged. This led to the Zwicker hearing of February 18th and the ensuing controversy over Senator McCarthy's alleged abuse of Zwicker at a closed session.

In the meantime Senator McCarthy and his staff had been telling the Secretary and Mr. Adams that it looked as if it would be necessary to subpoena members of the Army Loyalty Board to see who was responsible for the Peress preferential treatment. This resulted in the high level conference of January 21, 1954, attended by Attorney General Brownell, presidential assistant Sherman Adams, United Nations ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Mr. Adams, and others. Mr. Adams testified that at this conference he connected the issuance of subpoenas for the Loyalty Board members with Roy Cohn's desire to obtain a commission for Schine. There is evidence that he also connected the two things in talking with each member of the Senate Committee, and may have even implied that embarrassing disclosures would be made if the subpoenas were not called off.

The majority of the Committee exonerated Senator McCarthy from the charge that he was trying to help Schine get a commission although they criticized him for not disciplining members of his staff. The cumulative evidence of many jolly social affairs attended by Adams, Cohn, and Schine right up to the time of the charge of pressure seems to favor the Senator and his staff. The monitored telephone calls introduced by the Army also support the Senator. Thus in the call of November 7, 1953, Secretary Stevens told Senator McCarthy with reference to the Schine matter, "You never have done or said anything . . . other than to take a friendly interest." And in the telephone call of March 8, 1954, between Senator Symington and Secretary Stevens, in which Symington asked for further data concerning Cohn and Schine, Secretary Stevens said with reference to the proposed charge of pressure, "I personally think that anything in that line would prove to be very much exaggerated . . . as far as the

treatment of me is concerned, I have no personal complaint."

And so when we view the Army charge in the light of this evidence and the well-known practice of Senators and Congressmen to press the claims of their constituents for preferential treatment, we find little justification for conducting a 36-day hearing with its two million words of testimony on a nation-wide television hookup.

However, prior to and throughout the hearing it appeared that the Army had the full backing of President Eisenhower and his Cabinet. This, together with the obvious attempt to blow up the Cohn-Schine incident into national importance, served to dignify the matter and transform it into a controversy between the legislative and the executive branches of government. The executive branches were asserting their right to make their own investigations of their own personnel.

And yet we find that Congress in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 charged the Committee on Government Operations with the duty to study such operations at all levels with a view to determining their economy and efficiency; and Congress provided that the Committee, including any subcommittee, is authorized to hold hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such documents as it deems advisable, and to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction.

Time does not permit an analysis of this important constitutional question. Very persuasive in favor of the Senate's authority are such cases as those of Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White. Hiss and White held powerful positions, one a high office in the State Department, and the other in the Treasury Department, for several years after FBI reports showing their communist connections had been carefully filed away in pigeonholes in their departments. These facts were brought out only by congressional investigating committees primarily using information obtained from informers.

In the Army-McCarthy hearing it was admitted by Secretary Stevens that, if the McCarthy Committee could show that it had uncovered one Communist, its efforts would be justified, and yet we find it reliably reported that up to October 27, 1954, six employees had been discharged by the Army and three had resigned who were on McCarthy's Fort Monmouth list, and that the Army had completed its investigation of only about half of those on the list.

Some of the other tangible benefits derived from the work of the McCarthy Committee are: the Defense Department adopted improved policies and procedures governing the military personnel security program; the Voice of America corrected waste and mismanagement; thirty thousand "pro-communist" books were removed from overseas libraries by the State Department; a new system of file security was adopted in the State Department to avoid the practice of stripping files of loyalty material; and a number of security risks were removed from the Government Printing Office, a sensitive area, and additional precautions adopted.

Abraham Lincoln is reputed to have said that this country will never be conquered by enemies from without but only by enemies from within. This danger to our country from within is a matter of such overriding importance that it would seem that the departments of government should settle their jurisdictional disputes and work together to get rid of our common enemies.

## IV

## THE ARMY'S ACCUSATIONS: ON THE SURFACE AND BENEATH

Ordean G. Ness

After thirty-six days and two million words of testimony, the "trial" was over. It was obvious to many of the twenty million spectators that the final verdict could not immediately be given and probably would never be clear-cut. The hearings, designed to answer questions of guilt or innocence, resulted, not in definite answers, but in new and more imposing questions.

Many factors contributed to this inconclusiveness. However, in order to limit myself, this paper examines primarily the genesis of the Army's basic accusations, and presents this thesis: that the origin and the nature of the Army's case were such as to make unlikely any precise findings.

In regard to origin, a clash between Secretary Robert T. Stevens and Senator Joseph R. McCarthy now seems to have been inevitable. Stevens testified that he had long been concerned about the effect of "headline" investigations on Army morale. When the Zwicker incident occurred, Stevens entered into open battle with McCarthy. But a few days later he surrendered in the now famous "Memorandum of Understanding." Although Stevens immediately claimed "misinterpretation," it was generally felt that he lost this round.

In an attempt to recoup, the Defense Department, through Acting Secretary Roger Kyes and Secretary Stevens, tried for strong White House backing on the Zwicker matter. But backing was denied, presumably by the President. The Army lost face in this endeavor; some other direct challenge had to be made.

The Zwicker incident is also significant because the support, or lack of support, given Stevens in that instance was duplicated in the Schine hearings. True, both the President and the Secretary of Defense publicly avowed, from the sidelines, their confidence in the honesty of the Army charges. But even after John Adams revealed the January 21 White House conference about Schine, the Administration furnished the Army with no real backing or assistance.

Stevens was made to appear the sole adversary in the showdown with McCarthy. Even without knowledge of the high-level executive conferences, the public could scarcely believe that neither the Defense Department nor the Administration was behind Stevens. A bureaucracy—which the federal Administration is—requires exacting and strict discipline, particularly in its relations with outside agencies. Here the Army, a subordinate administrative department, was challenging another branch of the government. It can reasonably be assumed that Stevens would not and could not have preferred his charges without, at the very least, his superiors' tacit approval. Little more than that was given him.

Rhetorically, the decision to limit the Administration's support seems significant. The prestige of the Defense Department and of the President might have helped Stevens and Adams; at the least, it would have deprived McCarthy of one of his diversionary issues. And it might have dispelled the aura of triviality which surrounded the recital of intrigues and maneuverings of important governmental personages around a single inductee.

As for the nature of the Army's case, Stevens' charges seem singularly uncomplicated: McCarthy, Cohn, and Carr

brought "improper pressure" on the Army to obtain preferential treatment for Private Schine. These charges were questions of fact. The subject matter was forensic in nature. In the original accusations and in most of the testimony, scant attention was given to underlying philosophical principles. The Army was primarily intent on establishing that on a particular date a particular event took place.

The presentation of this sort of case may have suited a courtroom, but the Committee holding the hearings was at best only quasi-judicial, and the tenor of the hearings was anything but judicial. The proceedings fluctuated constantly between the forensic and the deliberative, but seldom did Army witnesses or counsel deviate from the original strategy of trying to make a legal case.

It was not that there were no significant principles here. However, Army witnesses had been "called" to testify by Congress. There is a certain protocol in that situation. The Army had been asked to explain and prove their charges. This they tried to do. They had not been asked to propound principles of legislative-executive interaction. And this they did not do except when specifically asked. In addition, Stevens and Adams were, in a sense, arguing their case in the enemy camp. Too much expansiveness would have been inappropriate.

Hence, the Army's case was mainly a recital of events intended to lead to the conclusion that improper pressure had been used. It consisted of three main arguments: (1) that the frequency and constancy of the Schine requests were, in and of themselves, improper; (2) that personal threats accompanied some requests; (3) and that threats to expose the Army's "inefficiency" and "coddling of Communists" were by implication injected into other requests.

The first of these arguments was pretty much a matter of value judgment. What is the magic number at which congressional requests become improper? There can be no satisfactory answer.

Army witnesses enumerated sixty-five telephone calls and nineteen conferences about Schine. But because of the pattern of the investigation, it was difficult to accumulate this evidence and present it with telling effect. During the direct and cross-examination each event was considered individually. In many separate instances the witnesses were forced to admit that a given event by itself did not seem "improper." The cumulation lost effectiveness because the Army could not prove that each and every incident merited criticism, and also because the Army had actually yielded to a number of the requests.

The second argument also depends on interpretation, and illustrates a basic problem of proof throughout the hearings. Most of the alleged personal threats were made in face-to-face conferences. Evidence consisted only of a witness' statement under oath that he recalled the threats as having been made. The obvious occurred. Over two-thirds of such statements were either categorically denied, or were admitted in substance but not in intent. In the remainder, the answer usually was, "I don't believe I said that, but I cannot recall." Impasse after impasse resulted.

In addition, the charge that there were threats suffered from a certain air of levity. Stevens and Adams both tried to make these purported threats seem serious, but Stevens himself chuckled as he reported that Cohn had threatened to "wreck the Army" and "get the Secretary." The picture of the head of the nation's largest military force being al-

ternately amused and troubled by such verbal outbursts did not enhance the prestige of the case. And the whole issue lost punch when it was disclosed that Stevens, in a telephone conversation three days prior to issuing the charges, said, "as far as I personally am concerned, I don't have a lot of stuff so far as my contact with Joe, or the Committee, is concerned."

The third argument was the most serious. The very fact that committee personnel made requests concerning Schine while they were investigating Army security risks suggests impropriety. Both the majority and minority committee reports criticized such requests at such a time.

But the Army's accusation went further. It averred that committee investigators promised "more reasonable" treatment if their requests were granted—and threatened more damaging treatment if they were not. The problems of substantiation here, which are similar to those noted above, were aggravated because "innuendo and implication" furnished almost the entire "proof." "Between-the-line" interpretations were easily denied.

There is also here a suggestion of bribery and blackmail. Such claims, however, can readily be reversed, and McCarthy did just that. The result was two completely irreconcilable contentions. Thus "blackmail" charges also were interpreted to show that the Army's cause was not without fault. If committee personnel did threaten to expose the Army's "coddling of Communists," and if the Army worried about the threat, there is an implied suggestion that some coddling did exist. Stevens and Adams tried to build prestige for their own security program, but McCarthy, claiming flaws in the system, made capital of the Peress case, the Monmouth investigations, and the defense plant situation. This weakened the Army's strongest argument.

My analysis does not mean that the Army had no case, or achieved no success. Both committee reports give credence to the claim that the interest of McCarthy's staff in Private Shine merited criticism, and thus was the Army vindicated.

At the same time, however, both reports also criticized Stevens and Adams for their handling of the affair. The Army did not emerge unscathed. At best, it won only a Pyrrhic victory. The Army's accusations and the context in which they originated contributed significantly to this result.

## V

## McCARTHY'S ANSWER: THE STRATEGY OF THE DEFENSE

Orville A. Hitchcock

The McCarthy side, in a sense, used the negative debate technique of taking every possible avenue of defense and attack. It is helpful to think of his case in these terms: "We didn't do it. Even if we did it, it wasn't improper. Even if it were improper, the other side did worse."

This outline, however, doesn't convey the force of the McCarthy counterattack. Acting on the principle that a strong offense is the best defense, the Senator, in effect, was saying: "Our investigating Committee is engaged in important and legitimate work. Certain people in the executive branch have tried to belittle and sabotage this work. They have succeeded. The excuse they use is trivial.

Behind their effort is something mysterious and dangerous. We must defeat this attack and get on with our vital investigations." Add to this the implication that anyone who is opposed to the McCarthy position is following a communist line or has other ulterior motives, and you have a general picture of the defense strategy.

Actually, three debates developed. One involved Schine and was broken down into a question of fact and a question of motive. The question of motive opened up another and larger debate concerning the interruption of the work of the investigating Committee. This, in turn, led to the revelation of certain constitutional issues underlying the whole argument, and this became a third debate. Since these constitutional issues—all connected with the conflict between the executive and legislative branches of the federal government—were in the picture from the beginning, they bring us around the full circle. The Schine matter was simply the trigger that touched off the debate on the more basic questions.

The essence of the McCarthy approach was to deny the charges with regard to Schine, but at the same time to make them appear trivial and unimportant, thus providing an opportunity for a shift of emphasis to issues more favorable to the Senator's side. He refused to allow the hearings to be confined to the immediate question. He selected his own battleground and insisted upon holding the fight there.

This pattern of charge and countercharge led McCarthy to rely heavily upon a basic technique mentioned by Aristotle in the *Rhetoric*, that of magnifying and diminishing. McCarthy labored mightily to build up the importance of his work and the competence of his staff, and to tear down the program and personnel of the opposition. To this end he pointed again and again to the vital nature of the investigations which his Committee was conducting, the successes that they had achieved, the important inquiries that were pending, the high caliber of his staff, and the efficiency with which they operated.

At the same time, the Wisconsin Senator cast doubts upon the motives and abilities of the opposition. The Army, he charged, was not doing a good job of unearthing security risks. They were slow and clumsy in their efforts. The Senator sought also to make Stevens look confused and inept, although well-meaning, and Adams aggressive and conniving, trying to protect his job. He suggested that Welch was a clever little lawyer. He attacked opposition witnesses whenever he could. Always he did these things with a flourish, dramatically and with showmanship.

McCarthy succeeded in part and failed in part in his strategy. On the Schine charges the McCarthy side did not escape unscathed. One arrives at a definite impression that he and his staff tried hard to secure favors for Schine. Whether or not this effort was improper is a matter of values and judgment, but the American voter is disturbed to find the staff of a major committee spending so much energy on such a minor item. The citizen who reads the transcript doubts that Schine was as important to the Committee as he was made out to be, wonders why he wasn't replaced sooner when it became evident that he must leave, and is surprised at the lack of evidence that he did much work for the Committee after induction into the Army. But McCarthy managed to put the Army into an embarrassing position by showing that they too had spent much time on the Schine affair and apparently were disposed to bargain over

him. He also made his point that the argument over Schine was somewhat less than world-shaking.

By pressing vigorously his counter-attack, McCarthy succeeded in shifting the pressure from himself and the Schine issue to the Army and its alleged attempts to interfere with the work of his investigating Committee. While he did not completely establish the charges, he made enough of his point to raise doubts in the minds of the people who followed the hearings. He showed that the Army moved rather slowly on the matter of security risks and that its officials were a bit reluctant to furnish full information to his Committee. He showed also that the Army was eager to be free of the investigative spotlight. And since the investigations of Army installations had actually been stopped by the present hearings, he was in a position to say that the Army had accomplished its purpose of interfering with his work.

Evil intent on the part of Army officials, however, was never satisfactorily demonstrated. Stevens and Adams maintained to the end that they did not object to investigation of military installations, but only to the way in which McCarthy handled the investigations and the hearings. They felt that his methods endangered national security, lowered the morale of Army personnel, and interfered with that body's legitimate functions. They were convincing when they said that they were just as eager as anyone else to rid the Army of security risks, and wanted only to have a voice in the process and to be free to carry out part of the job themselves.

The attempt on the part of McCarthy to find a sinister force behind the Army's actions seems to have failed. It is interesting to note how the villain—the real villain—shifted as the hearings proceeded. At first it was Stevens and Adams. Then it was Hensel. Later it was Rogers. Vaguely for a moment it was the Republican advisers of Eisenhower. Finally it was Senator Symington and Clark Clifford. Stevens and Adams came off better and better as the hearings progressed, while Symington and Clifford do not quite fill the role to which McCarthy tried to assign them.

Nor did McCarthy establish himself as the one and only person able to discover security risks. At the end Stevens and Adams appear as loyal and conscientious, differing with McCarthy only on the methods to be used in seeking out subversives. McCarthy showed that he and his staff were vigorous and aggressive, but in doing so, revealed that their methods of operation were not as efficient as they should have been. One gets a picture of a Committee dominated by one man and of an office routine in need of the services of an efficiency expert. The FBI, praised by everyone, emerged as the real hero.

This reviewer believes that the charges and countercharges ended in a stalemate. There are weaknesses on both sides, and the evidence is inconclusive. One is tempted to say, "A plague o' both your houses!" To this extent, McCarthy succeeded.

In the larger sense, however, McCarthy seems to have lost. There is no doubt that his popularity and influence have seriously declined. His loss in prestige can be traced in part to the hearings that we are examining. It is important to ask, "Why?" Part of the answer must lie in his all-out attack. By taking vigorously all possible approaches, the Senator placed an unfortunate emphasis on strategy. The case carried the mark of cleverness, almost of desperation. McCarthy gave the impression of flail-

ing wildly, hoping that one blow or another would hit.

But the failure was not so much in the case as in the man. Cohn handled himself so as to seem calm, modest, sincere. Carr presented himself as "strong and silent." McCarthy, however, appeared as a hard and ruthless fighter and thus prejudiced his case. In a sense he exhibited the very characteristics and methods that he sought to denounce. He was impatient, positive, wordy, extreme in his statement, and sometimes unkind. He dominated the hearings, was always dramatic and aggressive. He made charges recklessly. He moved in an atmosphere of suspicion, tension, and emotion.

I do not wish to underestimate the Senator's intelligence and ability. On occasion he was coldly analytical. He could take a question and in a few short sentences penetrate to its roots. His favorite method of stating his ideas was to say "Number 1 . . . , Number 2 . . . ," outlining his thinking in clear-cut manner. He was quick and flexible. He had a sense of humor, although of a sharp, biting kind. He could be pleasant and friendly. His language was conversational, often vivid. He used homely comparisons effectively. He realized the value of repetition. Often he phrased key points in apt words and then repeated them over and over as a refrain: "Pentagon politicians," "Fifth Amendment Communists."

When points needed to be emphasized, he pulled all the stops. Things were never just bad; they were the worst he had ever seen. "It is the most grossly dishonest thing I have seen in ages" is typical of his remarks. A favorite device for emphasis was to add the word "period" at the end of a sentence. Talking at a keyed-up level most of the time, he had to reach for new methods to gain greater positiveness.

Emotional statements occurred frequently, usually at the end of units of argument. McCarthy would start analytically—explain, consider the point at issue, state a position. Then, if pushed, he would rise to the conflict. With all his wits about him, he would lash into a strong statement. It seldom was merely defensive; he defended by striking back. He would use his moment as an opportunity to state his position anew, in a fresh light.

I have a feeling that McCarthy may have played to the wrong audience. He was well aware that the real jury was the American people. He directed himself, however, not toward the great mass of American citizens, but toward his supporters. Instead of presenting his case with dignity and restraint, which might have made an impression on the neutral group, he operated with force and explosiveness. Often calling the hearings a "circus," he proceeded to contribute more than anyone else toward making them so. He demonstrated that no one could outmaneuver him, that he knew all the tricks. He played too hard, was too full of surprises, too much in the limelight. In a very real sense, he defeated himself.

In the last analysis the battle became one of ethical proof. As Welch pointed out, aside from the constitutional issues, which could be decided only in the course of time by the people, the argument boiled down to one side saying "'Tis!" and the other, "'Taint!" The question then becomes, "Which side do you believe?" McCarthy was able to secure enough belief in his own case, and to cast enough doubt on the position of the Army, to create a stalemate on the immediate charges. In doing so, how-

ever, he used methods, and raised issues, which lost him the "campaign," and maybe the "war."

Serious doubts have been cast on the future of investigative committees. Sharp questions have been raised concerning how far Congress can go in looking into executive actions and how far the executive can go in barring information from Congress. The issue of the rights and responsibilities of federal employees in reporting governmental abuses has been opened for examination. Out of the hearings may come important decisions.

## VI

## BUT WILL IT SELL?

Ben Park

In a nation which has become secretly, if not openly, bored with politics, the phenomenon of large and interested audiences for televised public hearings presents challenging and significant questions for analysis. Here, for example, are two:

(1) Can television bring the complexities of political life and thought into meaningful scope for the practical consumption of a large number of Americans?

(2) Are the political leaders of America prepared to present other controversial issues as forcibly and dramatically as the issues which emerged to capture the imaginative interest of millions of Americans in the spring of 1954?

Whereas the mass media might have taken the initiative in building some sophistication into the national character during the 20's, 30's, and 40's of the present century, their sensation-ridden accounts of tragedy, treason, and mounting tensions seem only to have fostered cynicism and a general tendency to regard politics as something to be avoided. Thus the average American's mind, while buffeted with the storms of fear and with challenges to irrational allegiance to this cause or that, has withdrawn from fruitful thought on the men and influences shaping our lives. In defense of this withdrawal, it has been widely accepted that first-class manpower is not drawn into active political participation, and that the government is largely the concern of those mysterious political bosses who choose the candidates.

Small wonder that, having been intellectually bred out of his once-renowned liking for solid political discussion, the American of the 1950's has emerged as prey to the proponents of no-dissent conformity in the name of national security.

Frank and opinionated discussion of all issues, without regard for the consequences of conclusions logically arrived at, is absolutely necessary to the functioning of the open society. Nevertheless, we have seen fit, in the name of national survival, to curtail a considerable amount of the intellectual expression once enjoyed in the United States. And the citizenry has accepted this condition. The mass communications media have softened them up, it seems to me, by stating only superficially the end results, and by oversimplifying the underlying causes, pressures, and arguments. And the media have done this because they supposed, with some justification, that they were giving the public what it wanted.

What, then, of the overwhelmingly contrary evidence suggested by the pub-

lic's interest in the Army-McCarthy televised hearings?

Fundamentally, the public was interested in the hearings because of their theatrical nature, as analyzed by Mr. Curvin. Effective drama deals with verities, whether they are eternal problems of individual character, or are the currently pressing questions of society in rapid development. Surely, the drama of the Senate Caucus Room will in twenty years be as old-hat as the "problem plays" of the 1930's—but in the 1930's more theatregoers were interested in *Street Scene* and *Winterset* than in Shakespeare.

Nor was the play about the Army Private necessarily unique. Its issues far transcended the simple outlines of the plot. The same basic issues are seen in nearly every area of governmental and public life. Whether the next great play will take the form of a hearing, an investigation, a series of formal debates, or something else is not presently known. But it will happen. Should television again endeavor to establish a proscenium for the players?

Television has proved to the American people that politics is by no means dull. It has also given them a remarkably clear look at men who are patently not to be considered beneath the first class. Even if some cannot readily be classed, these men have made it strikingly evident that their values, standards, and morals are being incorporated with greater or less effectiveness into the actuality of our national life.

Notice has been served by the public that it will devour such spectacles as that broadcast from the Senate Caucus Room.

It is not an idle statement to say that twenty million Americans saw the hearings each day. From the standpoint of what would sell to a sponsor, however, we would have to reduce that figure to the number who saw the hearings at any one particular time of the day. Although the rating services vary somewhat in their estimates, it is fair to say that as many as ten to twelve million people saw the hearings during the "live" telecasts on an average day.

So the major precondition necessary to advertising interest was present. But the hearings were not widely sponsored. Why?

Apparently, the two networks which carried the broadcasts felt strongly that the subject matter was not "sponsorable." This was to be public service of a high character—this letting the public in on the great legislative-executive controversy. And one suspects that advertisers were wary of carrying the hearings; they are very sensitive to charges of "exploitation" in such circumstances.

But the lofty character of public service of ABC and DuMont soon became a source of anguish to the controllers of those two networks. The hearings were costing ABC $10,000 in facilities each day, DuMont $6,000. When they went beyond the second week, the hearings thus became a real burden.

NBC departed from the Caucus Room after the second day of its transmission of the hearings, on the ground that the hearings were not sufficiently well-received by the public. NBC's participation for only that length of time cost an estimated $120,000 in direct costs and rebates to dislodged sponsors.

NBC, in its statement about dropping the hearings, also mentioned the fact that other networks were carrying them, and that there was scant need for such expensive duplication.

CBS, with an even fuller commercial schedule, was more candid. They pointed out that to carry the hearings was

tantamount to losing $260,000 a week; so they did not bother.

Although they gained prestige by carrying the hearings, ABC and DuMont may not be so anxious to pick up the tab another time. Their attitude may well be: "We carried the ball last time. Now it's up to somebody else."

In another year, all the networks will have more sponsors than they do now. It will become more difficult for the smaller networks to devote great blocks of time to carrying public service programs.

The most logical answer would seem to be to allow sponsors to carry the public service program with commercials interspersed as they were during the political conventions.

But again we run into the objections of the networks that investigations and hearings fall beyond the pale to any but the most institutional of commercial messages. Nevertheless, the way out of the dilemma seems reasonably clear.

One's memory does not have to be long to recall that in the early days of broadcasting, only the mildest of commercials were permitted on any program, and presidents of networks were heard to say that radio, serving in the public interest, would never be a proper medium for general advertising. We have certainly traveled a long way from that view.

If we can assume that a way must and will be found for advertisers to pay, so that the broadcasts of future hearings can be made sound business, there are still some questions left unanswered. I intend only to raise them.

(1) The character of the Army-McCarthy hearings was profoundly affected by the presence of the TV audience. The principals were very much aware that what they said was being apprehended by millions. Senator McCarthy particularly seized the opportunity to educate his countrymen from his very first point of order, in which he excused the Department of the Army from responsibility for the charge raised by three civilians whom he termed "Pentagon politicians." Most of the Senators, as the case wore on, made use of their opportunities, as did Senator Jackson when he smilingly held up to ridicule Private Schine's thesis on anticommunist propaganda.

The opportunity to use television as a sounding board has not passed unnoticed. It would not be surprising if we are suddenly to be confronted by a rash of senatorial investigating committees, all with "hot" problems and issues which the public should see and hear. Some will be truly in the public interest. Others may not. Gauging from the determined strength shown by some of the participants in the Army-McCarthy dispute, the TV industry will have difficulty impartially selecting which affairs should be televised, and which should not. Who within the industry is going to take the responsibility to decide, when the terrors of demagoguery are involved, and both sides are pressuring for a hearing? And what is likely to be the result if the hearing gets on the air?

(2) The recent hearings were generally leaderless, except when one of the participants took over; consequently, many statements were made under the guise of questioning which should correctly have been admitted only as testimony. Had some of these latter statements been required to have the sanctity of the oath, it is questionable whether many of them would have been made.

Did the Army-McCarthy hearings constitute primarily an intellectual or an emotional exercise for the American

people? There was a basic conflict between radical antitraditionalism and conservative traditionalism as represented by McCarthy and his followers, on the one side, the Army and its defenders, on the other. Was this conflict seen in a rational or an irrational way by the public? How much that was not fact but radically-motivated opinion was accepted by the public as fact?

The theatre of the hearings was self-conscious *commedia dell'arte*. The actors were often miserably unskilled. They often rose to respectable heights. In the closing moments of the hearings, some of them, in great eloquence, made the finest curtain speeches I have ever heard. They indicated the dynamic, organic nature of the performance, and the basic truth most important of all: that this televised experience had been a momentary flash of lightning by which all could see, immobilized for an instant, the players and their relationships to each other. There were changes that took place here, too, and they would exercise some force in new directions. There may have been some mistakes made. Senator Potter, shortly after the hearings were closed, indicated that on both sides the testimony "was saturated with statements which were not truthful and which might constitute perjury."

Senator McClellan was strong at the bitter end when he declared: "Simply to say that this series of events is regrettable is a gross understatement. They are deplorable and unpardonable."

Certainly no one who saw and heard John McClellan could have felt that the drama had a conventional final curtain. One wanted to follow him and his colleagues to see where their convictions would further lead them.

But it was to Joseph Welch that the voice of the common people had been given. On the last day he said: "I alone came into this room from deep obscurity. I alone will retire to obscurity. It saddens me to think that my life has been lived so largely either in wars or in turmoil. I have already indicated that I could do with a little serenity. I allow myself to hope that soon there will come a day when there will in this lovely land of ours be more simple laughter."

Perhaps, though, after these hearings, the common people had been shorn of some of the tragic naïvete that had captured them after World War I. Perhaps now they could see that the peaceful laughter of the future must be won in the raucous, conflicting voices of today.

With considerable internal guidance, the television industry can sell itself, and advertisers, on the desirability of selecting for public consumption the significant moments in the present conflict.

## SENATORIAL HUMOUR

The grave legislators of our land are growing facetious of late. Among other jokes, we hear of one by the Boston candidate for the presidency. On the reading of a resolution the other day, "making inquiry into the expediency of establishing certain post-routes, to wit," etc. "Post-routes to wit!" remarked Mr. Webster, "they had better get *post-routes to wisdom!*"

*New-York Mirror*, XIV (July 9, 1836), 15.

# THE LIVING IBSEN

Einar Haugen

IT has long been recognized that one of the chief obstacles to a renewed interest in the drama of Ibsen is the pedestrian and by now rather musty translations of William Archer and company. Without in any way belittling Archer's achievement in his day, one is tempted to agree with Muriel C. Bradbrook's description of his translations as being "in the translator's equivalent of Basic English, without form or comeliness."[1] Archer's dour Scots conscience never permitted him to extend himself very far in the direction of the histrionic *mot juste*. Theatrical directors have now for some time been patching his English to make the dialogue palatable to modern audiences.

Just before World War II the English director Tyrone Guthrie entered upon a happy collaboration with the playwright Norman Ginsbury to render Ibsen fit for the modern theatre. *Ghosts* was the first to appear, being produced (by Miss Esmé Church) in 1937 and printed in 1938. In a foreword Guthrie praised Ginsbury for his success in conveying "not merely the explosion of Ibsen's big intellectual rockets, but the continuous sparkle and crackle of his humour—the golden rain of fancy and the squibs of fun."[2] These are words that may startle some of the conventional antagonists of Ibsen, who have chorused since his first appearance in England around 1890 that he was a kind of gloomy ghoul. Today there is a growing body of opinion that Ibsen not only had humor, but also that he had poetry, qualities which it has been fashionable to deny him. It is peculiarly fitting that this recognition should be strongest in England, where bourgeois austerity once forced him to stand as a symbol of bluestocking unconventionality in the rebellious suburbs. As Ross Scanlan has pointed out, critics of the nineteenth century found it difficult to admit that great art could also be polemical. "Today, then," he writes, "these conclusions seem inevitable: first, that Ibsen was a great artist; second, that he was a deliberate polemist."[3]

Mr. Ginsbury has continued his work of reinterpreting Ibsen to modern audiences by also translating *An Enemy of the People* (1939), *Peer Gynt* (1946), and *A Doll's House* (1950). These translations make a neat beginning on a complete *Works* which would be a boon to Ibsen and the theatre. As Guthrie says in the foreword to the *Peer Gynt* translation, "it is largely due to Archer that, for English people, the world of Ibsen appears so dowdy, so humdrum." And he adds: "It is still not realized what a humorous writer Ibsen is; still believed that his plays are exclusively concerned with footling old photographers handicapped by repellent whiskers and Nonconformist consciences, with huge serious women in mackintoshes, with the

*Einar Haugen (Ph.D., Illinois, 1931) is Thompson Professor of Scandinavian Languages at the University of Wisconsin; he is a former president of the Linguistic Society of America and the author of numerous books and articles in the field of Scandinavian languages and literatures.*

[1] *Ibsen the Norwegian* (London, 1948), p. 24.

[2] (London: Samuel French, 1938), p. 4.

[3] "The Challenge of Ibsen: A Study in Critical Contradictions," in *Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of Alexander M. Drummond* (Ithaca, 1944), p. 221.

disposal of sewage from the Reformatory. Norman Ginsbury has shown a witty man's perception of their humour, and a graceful tact in the relation of Norwegian social and theatrical conventions of the mid-nineteenth century to those of England today."[4] This comment is particularly apt in reference to the *Peer Gynt* version, which for the first time brings out the humor of Ibsen's play, even though it scarcely is adequate to the poetry. Now and then its turn of phrase is a mite too British for the American stage, but this can easily be remedied in production, as was shown by Ronald Mitchell when he produced it at the University of Wisconsin in 1950.

Parallel with the work of Ginsbury, the well-known English critic Una Ellis-Fermor has also tried her hand at rendering anew a group of Ibsen plays: *The Pillars of Society, The Wild Duck,* and *Hedda Gabler.* Her perceptive introduction includes a valuable discussion of the problems of translation, based on the conviction that "the undying imagination of the greatest modern dramatist is as much alive today as it was in 1870 or 1890 and that there must therefore be some kind of modern equivalent for his speech."[5] She presents as a critical instance of the problems of translation the passage in *Hedda Gabler* where Jörgen says to his unresponsive wife (in Archer's translation): "If you could bring yourself to say 'du' to her?" The 'du' in question is his Aunt Julia. Here Miss Fermor translates: "If you could bring yourself to speak a little more affectionately to her —as if you were one of the family." Eva Le Gallienne cuts the Gordian knot somewhat more simply in her version by writing: "If you could only be a little more affectionate with her—." It may be an English convention that makes it impossible for these translators to use the obvious equivalent, viz., first names. In the United States, at least, Jörgen would have said, "If you could only bring yourself to call her 'Aunt Julia'?" Miss Fermor's rendition of *Pillars of Society* as *Pillars of the Community* also seems unnecessarily novel. To refer to whole nations as "these big communities of today" adds nothing and makes the point no clearer than the word "societies."

This is hardly the place for detailed consideration of the good and bad points of the new translations. One that has at least proved its efficacy on the stage is Eva Le Gallienne's *Hedda Gabler,* which has now been published with a subtle, highly illuminating preface which might be described as this great actress's testament to future performers of the role. Her enthusiasm for the play is unflagging: "When you compare this original study with some modern plays that have in a sense followed the pattern, such as *Craig's Wife* or Hellman's *The Little Foxes,* Ibsen's genius dazzles one with its brilliance. The other women seem two-dimensional, black and white cut-outs, in comparison with 'Hedda.' There seems to be no end to the subtleties and infinite variety of Ibsen's woman."[6] One interesting comment is her change of mind about playing Hedda in modern dress, which she had done in her early years. She has ceased to think of Hedda as a "modern" woman and now prefers to see her "incurable romanticism" against a backdrop of the 90's. Hedda is a "great lady," "a highly-bred woman of dis-

[4] Henrik Ibsen, *Peer Gynt,* trans. Norman Ginsbury (London, 1946), p. 5.

[5] Henrik Ibsen, *Three Plays,* trans. Una Ellis-Fermor (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: The Penguin Classics, 1950), p. 22.

[6] Eva Le Gallienne, *Preface to Ibsen's Hedda Gabler with a New Translation of the Play* (London, 1953), p. 7.

tinction and poise," whose tragedy is her egoism, "her barrenness of spirit."[7] Eva Le Gallienne wishes to make her audiences realize that Ibsen's people "are all extremely human; though they lived in another era and in another land, the workings of their minds and hearts are universal and timeless."[8]

The work of Miss Le Gallienne in promoting Ibsen performances in the United States is well known. The really successful performances since World War II have nearly all been hers. Of her *John Gabriel Borkman* Joseph Wood Krutch wrote in 1946: "This particular play was written half a century ago by a man who was already old and who had never bothered to be in the slightest degree ingratiating; yet there are only a few moments when it seems old-fashioned rather than sternly timeless."[9] When she produced *Ghosts* at the Cort Theatre in 1948, Krutch wrote: "It serves at the very least to make it clear to anyone who has never seen the play performed just why it became the most famous stage piece of the nineteenth century." While he objected to the "modern interpretation," he insisted that "if the play is capable of being made to live fully again, that can only be done by making effective the emotional rather than the intellectual values, by remembering that the author certainly thought of it as a new kind of tragedy as well as an argument."[10]

Other New York performances have not fared as well. Luise Rainer in *Lady from the Sea* (1950) was described by *The Nation* as unequal to the task. But the play was praised: it "is full of ideas and insights, many of them prophetic of our contemporary preoccupation with matters psychological, and not at all outdated. And though the theme is very serious, there is a nice play of wit that is both intelligent and sharp."[11] Arthur Miller's adaptation of *Enemy of the People* with Fredric March was reviewed by Margaret Marshall as "a painful example of what can happen when such exploitation goes wrong. The weaknesses of the original—and they are considerable—are played up, not down, in this confused version."[12] An even more radical rewriting of Ibsen was Paul Green's *Peer Gynt* in 1951, which was described by the same reviewer as "not only cast in prose, but in prose which seems designed to turn a poetic drama into a topical, realistic play." "The result," she added, "is a mélange of the fantasy and the problem play which is convincing as neither, since it lacks the poetry of one and the actuality of the other."[13] *The Wild Duck* at the New York City Center in March, 1952, with Maurice Evans as Hjalmar Ekdal, was caustically dismissed by George Jean Nathan as "a production so wretched in every detail that it probably induced in the spectators a passionate desire to have done for all time with culture, if this was to be considered a sample of it."[14]

Good or bad as these productions may have been, it is a tribute to Ibsen's genius that so many have tried to present him to a Broadway notoriously inhospitable to literary plays. London has here done better, with war-time and post-war performances of *Hedda Gabler*, *Ghosts*, *Peer Gynt*, *A Doll's House*, *The Master Builder*, *The Wild Duck*, *Rosmersholm*, *John Gabriel Borkman*, and *Little Eyolf*. The most celebrated performance was Tyrone Guthrie's *Peer Gynt* at the Old Vic in 1944, with Ralph

[7] Le Gallienne, pp. 8, 11.
[8] Le Gallienne, p. 61.
[9] *The Nation*, CLXIII (1946), 629.
[10] *The Nation*, CLXVI (1948), 256.
[11] *The Nation*, CLXXI (1950), 174.
[12] *The Nation*, CLXXII (1951), 18.
[13] *The Nation*, CLXXII (1951), 139.
[14] *Theatre Arts*, XXXVI (1952), 70.

Richardson as Peer, Sibyl Thorndike as Mother Åse, and Laurence Olivier as the Button Moulder. Ibsen has even appeared on television, but when the effort was duplicated in the United States by Tallulah Bankhead, in January, 1954, the result was disastrous. While reviewer Philip Hamburger regarded Ibsen's *Hedda Gabler* as "an extremely impressive drama, no matter how you look at it," he described the televised version as "distinguished by a lack of integrity and by a persistent attempt to turn Ibsen's thought topsy-turvy."[15]

Critical literature has kept pace with the new dramatic interest in Ibsen. Although Eric Bentley included him in his *Playwright as Thinker*, the emphasis has not been on Ibsen's ideas. To be sure, Bentley lightly speaks of *Peer Gynt* with his "gay unscrupulousness, his adventurous egoism, and his amiable immorality" as "the Don Quixote of free enterprise" who "should be the patron saint of the National Association of Manufacturers."[16] It is difficult to see anything gay or amiable about the latter organization, but Bentley is primarily concerned with placing Ibsen in the tradition of Faustian striving. He flatly describes Ibsen as "the greatest writer of tragedies, not in medieval, but in modern dress."[17] Ibsen's tragic theme, he says, was the opposition between mass organization and the modern individualist, and Ibsen achieved greatness in three modes of dramatic expression of this conflict: "the dramatic poem on the pattern of *Faust;* the naturalistic play on the French pattern; and the symbolic drama which was Ibsen's late variant on the French pattern."[18] Bentley emphasizes the subtlety of Ibsen's dialogue: "Ibsen pretends to write flat dialogue, but the opaque, uninviting sentences carry rich meanings which are enforced only by their context. . . . Its very naturalness is the final artifice, the art that conceals art."[19]

In a brilliantly conceived article entitled "Ibsen, Pro and Con," which appeared first in *Theatre Arts,* but now is included in a Modern Library College Edition of four Ibsen plays, Bentley again pursues this theme. He brings up many of the old charges against Ibsen for unpoetic language, stale ideas, and melodramatic structure, but only to refute them by emphasizing the specifically dramatic quality of Ibsen's writing: "He is one of the great modern writers. Like most of the others he has presented modern life to us in the form of fable, parable, myth and, once you realize that his medium was theatre and not the book, you will not find his fables inferior to those of other masters. Ibsen is a poet. Although he gave up verse, he managed to enrich and intensify his work by so many other means that the verse plays of the best poets since his time—T. S. Eliot's, for example—seem dilute and 'unpoetic' by comparison."[20]

In England a whole school of writers has devoted itself to the purpose of making Ibsen known to their countrymen. These are not Ibsenites in the old sense of the word, and their interests do not stem from the controversial aspects of his writing. Since most of them are associated with universities, particularly Cambridge, they are scholarly and dispassionate in their approach, but motivated by an enthusiasm for Ibsen that is apparent on every page. Professor Brian W. Downs is the leader of the

[15] *The New Yorker* (Jan. 23, 1954), 73.
[16] Eric Bentley, *The Playwright as Thinker* (New York, 1946), p. 58.
[17] Bentley, p. 93.
[18] Bentley, p. 57.
[19] Bentley, pp. 124-25.
[20] *Theatre Arts,* XXXIV (1950), 42; *Plays by Henrik Ibsen: Ghosts, A Doll's House, An Enemy of the People, The Master Builder, with introd. by Eric Bentley* (New York, 1950), p. xix.

group, and his *Ibsen, The Intellectual Background* pioneered an amazing English productivity in this long neglected field. Downs did not hesitate to declare in his preface that "Ibsen is a very great author, one of the supreme dramatists of all time."[21] His sober analysis is not a document of criticism, however, but a presentation of fairly well-known materials concerning the literary and intellectual influences that determined the themes and techniques of Ibsen's writing. He took a step forward into a more personal criticism by writing *A Study of Six Plays by Ibsen*.[22] The six plays are made up of three romantic and three realistic ones, and his study of them affords probably the best introduction to Ibsen's writing now available in English (or any other language). The plays have been woven into their life contexts and into their relations to the plays that precede and follow.

Another Cambridge scholar who has analyzed Ibsen is Muriel C. Bradbrook, known also for studies in Elizabethan drama and T. S. Eliot. The title of her book, *Ibsen the Norwegian*, suggests its theme: to restore Ibsen to his Norwegian background, following his own utterance: "He who would know me fully must know Norway."[23] She describes the Norwegian character as having in common with Ibsen's plays a rhythm consisting of a "culmination of slow pressure" which "ends in an explosion."[24] Like other critics she insists on the poetry rather than the message, and her chapters bear titles like "The Making of an Artist," "The Poet," "The Moralist," "The Humanist," and "The Visionary." She criticizes sharply those who think of Ibsen as outmoded, retaining "the false perspective of his contemporary critics and admirers."[25] She notes that his "greatness has of recent years been increasingly appreciated," and classes him with Tolstoy as "incomparably the greatest literary figures of their time."[26] "Purely as a theatrical, as distinct from a dramatic, artist Ibsen offers the actors more than Shakespeare."[27] She finds that the recurrent theme of his plays is "the destructive power of genius."[28] In her book one reads also an interesting comment on Ibsen's art by Virginia Woolf, who wrote in 1942 that Ibsen succeeded in making "the paraphernalia of reality at certain moments become the veil through which we see infinity."[29]

How this was accomplished is the theme of two books on Ibsen with highly similar titles, but quite dissimilar contents: P. F. D. Tennant's *Ibsen's Dramatic Technique*[30] and John Northam's *Ibsen's Dramatic Method*.[31] Tennant makes much of the "illusion of reality" which was characteristic of Ibsen's writing: "From his earliest days he insisted on illusion and not reality as the basis of art."[32] Tennant speaks of *Ghosts* as "this highly romantic and unrealistic play, with its Greek atmosphere of destiny brooding over the haunting family tragedy," by means of which "Ibsen established his international fame as a modern realistic dramatist."[33] Tennant then proceeds to outline Ibsen's method of composition, his association with the stage, and the various elements in the plays, such as the settings, stage directions, plots, expositions, and endings, which contributed to their effectiveness. Of the technique he says that

21 (Cambridge, 1946), p. ix.
22 (Cambridge, 1950).
23 Bradbrook, p. 1.
24 Bradbrook, p. 19.
25 Bradbrook, p. 2.
26 Bradbrook, p. 81.
27 Bradbrook p. 1 n.
28 Bradbrook, p. 2.
29 Bradbrook, p. 98.
30 (Cambridge, 1948).
31 (London, 1953).
32 Tennant, p. 16.
33 Tennant, p. 13.

it deluded his contemporaries into accepting him as a thinker. But "it is the same technique which for posterity has marked him as a dramatist of the first order."[34] Tennant concludes that "his aesthetic detachment as a poet, however much it may have exasperated Strindberg or the poor individuals who suffered as his models, seems to be the very quality in Ibsen's nature which has saved his work from the fate of passing into oblivion with his time."[35]

Northam's work is more narrowly oriented, but also more original and searching in its approach. Basing his study on the importance of visual imagination in Ibsen's artistic work, he has addressed himself to the task of identifying the specific symbolic content of Ibsen's stage business throughout the prose plays. He shows how Ibsen used directions and parallel situations, in short, the unspoken information conveyed by visual effects, to throw light on the characters and the action. Lest anyone should doubt the significance of his identifications, he shows that most of these elements were added by Ibsen in the last reworking of the plays, and the effect was achieved only after repeated trial and effort on the author's part. "The object of this essay," he writes, "is to show how this incidental symbolism, or visual suggestion, in fact helps to delineate the characters whose creation places Ibsen amongst the greatest dramatists."[36] It can safely be said that Northam achieves his object, for the demonstration he gives is highly convincing, even inspiring for the interested reader. This should be required reading for every stage manager who puts on Ibsen, every actor who performs him, and every teacher who professes to talk of him in the classroom.

[34] Tennant, p. 120.
[35] Tennant, p. 123.
[36] Northam, p. 13.

The triumph of Northam's book is that while it is based on facts hitherto available to everyone, it combines them in a way that is eminently original. It gives substance to those rather airy references to Ibsen's symbolism which have been asserted by so many. His treatment of Rebecca's white shawl in *Rosmersholm* may serve as a sample. He shows how it clashes with the impression of gentle harmony in the setting of the old family manor, how Rebecca stops her crocheting of it when the White Horse of Rosmersholm is mentioned, how it constantly reappears in connection with the influence of the Rosmer spirit on her life, how it is completed after her defeat, and how she puts it on as she walks out with Rosmer to their double suicide, where it becomes her only shroud. The shawl thus serves as a physical symbol of the White Horse which, in turn, is the repressive spirit of Rosmersholm. Yet Ibsen did not hit upon this feature until his final reworking of the play. The effect of Northam's demonstration is to fill out our conception of Ibsen's plays as artistic wholes, as poems, in which visual suggestion takes the place of the verbal suggestion offered by traditional verse drama. In this way Northam has succeeded, as he wished, in substantiating Ibsen's "pre-eminence over all but the very greatest in dramatic art."[37]

Another evidence of the continuing interest in Ibsen is the revision and publication of a book by Professor Janko Lavrin on Ibsen. Lavrin, known also for his studies of Nietzsche, Tolstoy, and the Russian novel, originally published *Ibsen and his Creation* in 1921. His new book is entitled *Ibsen, An Approach*, and takes up the subject "from the angle of an age which has justified some of his (Ibsen's) worst forebodings

[37] Northam, p. 220.

and apprehensions."[38] Lavrin declares that "Ibsen the playwright has certainly withstood the test of time, and his contribution to the modern drama in general is beyond dispute . . ." Ibsen's personal problem, he finds, is that of the "schizophrenic modern" which he shared with Dostoevsky, Strindberg, and others, and "the power with which Ibsen the artist stated his personal dilemma in terms of universal values is the measure of his genius."[39] Parallel to this praise from England comes a discussion by the American Francis Fergusson, in *The Idea of a Theater:* "Ibsen and Chekhov were able to place in this narrow theater a certain kind of theatrical poetry. It is a hidden poetry, masquerading as reporting; it is a 'poetry of the theater' (in M. Cocteau's phrase) and not a poetry of words; and it is based upon the histrionic sensibility and the art of acting: it can only be seen in performance or by imagining a performance."[40]

The interest in Ibsen by recent critics is perhaps not entirely unconnected with the demonstrated admiration for him by older writers whose star is today high among the literati, viz., James Joyce and Henry James. Vivienne K. Macleod has pointed out the enthusiasm for Ibsen which the young Joyce entertained, as appears not only in his impressive review in 1900 of *When We Dead Awaken* and his forthright ranking in 1918 of Ibsen above Shakespeare as a playwright, but also his words in *Stephen Hero,* the original draft of *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man:* "Here and not in Shakespeare or Goethe was the successor to the first poet of the Europeans, here, as only to such purpose in Dante, a human personality had been found united with an artistic manner which was in itself almost a natural phenomenon: and the spirit of the time united one more readily with the Norwegian than with the Florentine."[41]

While Joyce saw in Ibsen above all the rebel and critic of bourgeois society, James admired the craftsman. He attended all Ibsen performances in London and wrote four essays on him between 1891 and 1897. Francis Fergusson quotes him as saying that Ibsen's characters "have the extraordinary, the brilliant property of becoming when represented at once more abstract and more living."[42] But it is the contention of Herbert Edwards[43] that Ibsen's influence was paramount on James during his later years when he was trying to write novels that would have the objectivity of the drama. James wrote of Ibsen's "perfect practice of a difficult and delicate art," of the "admirable closeness" of *Hedda Gabler,* "the dense complexity of moral cross references" in *Pillars of Society.*[44] Just like the recent critics, James insisted that Ibsen was neither a social reformer nor a thinker, but a great dramatic artist whose new dramatic technique "has cleared up the air we breathe and set a copy for our renouncement; has made many things wonderfully plain and quite mapped out the prospect."[45] In an impulsive moment he wrote, after reading *John Gabriel Borkman,* "What an old boy is our northern Henry!—he is too delightful—an old darling!"[46] Herbert Edwards argues that James found in Ib-

[38] (London, 1950), p. 1.
[39] Lavrin, p. 135.
[40] *Idea of a Theater* (Princeton, 1949), p. 147.
[41] Vivienne K. Macleod, "The Influence of Ibsen on Joyce: Addendum," *PMLA,* LXII (1947), 574.
[42] *Idea of a Theatre,* p. 152.
[43] Herbert Edwards, "Henry James and Ibsen," *AL,* XXIV (1952-3), 208-23.
[44] "On the Occasion of *Hedda Gabler*" (1891), reprinted in Henry James, *The Scenic Art,* ed. Allan Wade (New Brunswick, 1948), pp. 248, 252.
[45] *Ibid.,* p. 243.
[46] Elizabeth Robins, *Theatre and Friendship*

sen a use of symbols which he admired, to disguise meaning, but rather to give concretion to the subtle and submerged, the unspoken and the mysterious in the heart of man."[47]

It appears that in the age-long debate on whether Ibsen was or was not an artist, the English-speaking world has at length declared itself for the affirmative. Even T. S. Eliot granted in a conversation with the writer that "Ibsen is at length emerging as the poet he really was—contrary to the impression given by William Archer and George Bernard Shaw." If sufficient new translations are provided to keep Ibsen's language abreast of the rapidly changing language of the English and American theatre, and if commentaries like those that have here been discussed are pondered by literary critics and theatrical producers, Ibsen will continue to live on stage and in world literature. Other dramatic techniques have followed but not superseded his. The important fact brought out by the testimony of the leading critics and scholars here quoted has been that Ibsen belongs to the "literature of power" and that he has a rank in this literature which builds upon his ability to combine visual and verbal suggestion into structural wholes. His plays are as surely artistic as Shakespeare's or Molière's, even though his techniques are vastly different.

(New York, 1932), p. 184.

[47] Herbert Edwards, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

## AMERICAN ACTORS

The people of the United States pay large sums to support the stage; and they never flinch at any amount of taxation, provided it be voluntary. It is a singular fact, that a people, whose veins are generally so flexible, clear and easy, and whose temperament is so ethereal, should not have produced more distinguished actors. Of the many who have tried the stage, but few, a very few, have succeeded. Morse played some parts with effect while he was an actor, but he had neither industry nor perseverance to make a great performer. A young stage-struck reader of plays thinks he is most admirably fitted for a tragedian; but, when he comes to the trial, finds that there is something wanting, but which, no doubt, in his mind, experience will soon supply; but, after toiling for years, he often finds the same deficiencies, and gives up the pursuit in despair. John Howard Payne and Forrest are exceptions.

Colonel McKenzie in the *New-York Mirror*, XII (April 11, 1835), 325.

# THE PRO-NORTHERN MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND, 1861-1865

E. James Lennon

## I

THE demand of English friends of the South that Great Britain recognize and aid the Confederacy posed an ominous threat to Northern success in the Civil War and to the future of British-American relations. That their voice was not unheeded became obvious during the second year of the war when relations between America and England were nearly ruptured by verified reports of British construction of warships for the South. Such British aid threatened to reopen blockaded Southern ports and supply munitions needed for Confederate victory.

There were vigorous public and official protests from America, and the two countries were brought to the brink of war. In March, 1863, as the Liverpool-built *Alabama* continued to prey on Northern shipping and English yards were building new and better ironclads for the Confederate Navy, the American Minister at London, Charles Francis Adams, privately recorded his fear that "the peace will scarcely last six months."[1]

In a persuasive campaign to prevent aid to the South, English friends of the North utilized platform, pulpit, and press. The climax of their efforts was a series of pro-Northern mass meetings held during the first three months of 1863. The addresses of English speakers at the meetings aroused for the Union a fervent expression of popular sympathy, which was accompanied by widespread comment in the press and discussion in Parliament. In revealing public disapproval of British policy favoring the Confederacy, the English speakers for the Union were influential in bringing about a government ban on the supply of English ships for the South, a measure which eased the tension between Great Britain and the United States. The ban, reflecting a decisive shift in Government policy probably occurring in the spring of 1863, was put into effect in September of that year.

Several Americans participated in the pro-Northern movement in England, but their combined influence, though considerable, did not equal that of the much more numerous English speakers for the Union. Outstanding among the Americans was Henry Ward Beecher, famed Brooklyn pastor, whose addresses in five cities in October, 1863, attracted large audiences and evoked much enthusiasm.

Because he spoke during the year of crisis in British-American relations, some students have given Beecher undue credit for arousing pro-Northern sympathy in England and for dissuading the British Government from allowing further supply of Confederate warships.[2]

*E. James Lennon (Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1952) is Instructor in Speech at Wisconsin State College, Eau Claire.*

[1] Charles Francis Adams, *Studies Military and Diplomatic, 1775-1865* (New York, 1911), p. 357. On a visit to London at this time the American Consul General at Paris, John Bigelow, said an Anglo-American war was "inevitable."

[2] Compare Oliver Wendell Holmes, "The Minister Plenipotentiary," *Atlantic Monthly*, XIII (1864), 106-112; Thomas W. Knox, *Life and Work of Henry Ward Beecher* (Hartford, 1887), pp. iii, 193, 207; and Lionel Crocker, "Henry Ward Beecher and the English Press of 1863," *SM*, VI (1939), 20-43.

In developing this theory of Beecher's role, Professor Lionel Crocker argues that the Government's restriction on shipbuilding for the Confederacy, which was put in effect a month before Beecher spoke in England, did not reflect a decisive shift in Government policy, and probably would have been rescinded, had Beecher not revealed the pro-Union attitude of English commoners. Overlooking the pro-Northern mass meetings addressed by English speakers several months before Beecher arrived and the widespread attention they received, Crocker says of the situation in England before Beecher spoke: "The statesmen and journalists reflected none of the thought of the lower classes," and "the working classes had no way of letting their will be known. . . ."[3] But this appraisal does not take into account the fact that the pro-Northern sentiment of English commoners, including that of the workingmen, already had been expressed at the pro-Northern mass meetings, nor does it acknowledge the important accomplishment of the English speakers who addressed the meetings.

The present paper is being written to describe the forgotten efforts of the pro-Northern English speakers and to indicate the nature of the persuasive task they faced as they went before British audiences.

## II

British advocates of the Confederacy enjoyed the advantage of a head start in arguing their case before the English public. With few exceptions, they included in 1861 and 1862 the most influential leaders of British opinion. Much of the press, including the powerful *Times* of London, supported the South. Pulpits of the Church of England resounded with a proslavery exegesis of Holy Writ. Some members of Parliament openly advocated recognition of the Confederacy and argued that Secession was Constitutional.[4] Pro-Southern Americans and Confederate agents also spoke in defense of the South.

Although British friends of the South differed widely on slavery and other war issues, many of them pooled their efforts in organizations formed in no less than thirty-one English and Scottish communities and sponsored by eight members of Parliament. The influence of these organizations was exerted mainly through newspapers, periodicals, and pamphlets. Their attempts to hold public meetings usually were not successful.[5]

The persuasive methods of the Southern sympathizers were marked by cogent appeals to reason. Current happenings were adroitly interpreted to link Confederate victory with the welfare of Great Britain and to convince many English antislavery people that the North was using the slavery issue falsely as an excuse for aggression. The fact that Northern warships were blockading Southern ports implied that the Union was responsible for shutting off the supply of Southern cotton from Lancashire textile factories and thus for the unemployment and distress among the workingmen.[6] The fact that President Lincoln had not demanded abolition but only limitation of the further spread of slavery engendered suspicion in the minds of antislavery people and

[3] Crocker, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

[4] Donaldson Jordan and Edwin J. Pratt, *Europe and the American Civil War* (Boston, 1931), pp. 100, 115, 132-133.

[5] See Dan Gow's speech in his *Civil War in America* (Manchester, Eng., n. d.), p. 24; see also Jordan and Pratt, pp. 172-173.

[6] On this point the usually pro-Southern *Times* of London disagreed, stating on October 21, 1861, that the Confederacy had put a restriction on shipment of cotton in a move to tempt foreign nations using the commodity to violate the blockade, thus involving themselves in the war on the Southern side.

seemed to support the Southern sympathizers' contention that the North had taken such a position merely to create the illusion that it was motivated by a noble and altruistic purpose, thus cloaking its real intention, which was to subjugate and exploit the South. After Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on September 22, 1862, the South's defenders did not abandon their argument but restated it with the corollary charge that the Proclamation was merely a desperate move of military expediency.

Many Englishmen who regarded the United States as a loose federation of states which had surrendered only a small part of their sovereignty were inclined to agree when Southern sympathizers told them that Secession was no more than the exercise of a state's right and that the aggression of the Federal armies was unwarranted "invasion."

In what the *Daily Advertiser* called an "able and eloquent exposition," Hiram Fuller, former editor of the New York *Evening Mirror*, told a London audience in December, 1861, that Secession was the reasonable right of the South because the American Union was unsupportable, a system of "logical inconsistencies and political incongruities." "The theory of State sovereignty and Federal supremacy," he added, "is not only a gross absurdity in terms, but a simple impossibility in fact."[7]

Addressing two thousand persons in Newcastle in October, 1861, the British Foreign Secretary, Earl Russell, regretted the war which threatened "the great experiment on the new continent," but found it necessary to add that "we now see the two parties contending together, not upon the question of slavery, though I believe that was probably the original cause of the quarrel—not contending with respect to Free Trade and Protection, but contending, as so many states of the Old World have contended, the one side for empire and the other for independence."[8]

To side with the Confederacy was to side with political liberty, Englishmen were told. The claim that the Confederacy was fighting for independence from oppression awakened traditional British sympathies with the extension of freedom. Secession seemed entitled to the same enthusiastic approval that Englishmen had accorded Italy a few years earlier during its strugggle for independence from Austrian domination.[9] Archbishop Richard Whately, citing a similar parallel, said that Englishmen generally considered the South to have as much right to secede in 1861 as the Americans to revolt from Great Britian in 1775.[10]

Although the *Times* did not advocate official recognition of the Confederacy and conceded that "Secession was not justifiable," it declared that from the beginning of the fighting "it was plain . . . that the American Union was a thing of the past" and that America should submit to disunion in the interests of peace. ". . . When ten millions of people had declared their resolution to achieve their independence by force of arms, it was too late to enter into questions of State rights or Federal prerogatives. . . . The 'inexorable logic of facts' precluded all further dissertation" and required that "the belligerents . . . should come to such terms as would stop the bloodshed."[11]

Proponents of the South predicted

[7] Hiram Fuller, *The Causes and Consequences of the Civil War in America* (London, n. d.), p. 7.

[8] *Times*, Oct. 16, 1861.

[9] James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States From the Compromise of 1850* (New York, 1893-1919), IV, 76; William Edward Hartpole Lecky, *Democracy and Liberty* (New York, 1896), I, 490.

[10] Jordan and Pratt, p. 157.

[11] *Times*, Dec. 12, 1861.

that defeat of the North would bolster English political stability by reducing the influence of the Radicals, notably John Bright. For several years Bright had pointed to the extension of suffrage and prosperity of workingmen in the Northern states in support of his demand for broader suffrage in Great Britain. The probability that defeat of the North would discredit "Brightism" and weaken the movement for further democratization was sufficient reason for his opponents to hope for Confederate success. Describing "the wishes of the privileged classes," the American Minister, Charles Francis Adams, wrote Secretary of State Seward from London in June, 1864: "Very little sympathy is entertained for the rebels. The true motive . . . is the fear of the spread of democratic feeling . . . in the event of our success."[12]

By selection and interpretation of events in America, pro-Southern newspapers and speakers informed the English people that the Union armies were doomed to failure, that Northern civilian morale and confidence in Lincoln were waning rapidly, and that essential civil liberties cherished by free peoples everywhere had been abolished. Suspicion was aroused that the North planned aggression against Great Britain.

Addressing his constituents at Stroud on December 10, 1861, Edward Horsman, M. P., said: "The South has proved itself able to hold its own, and the North has shown not only military failures, but a complete breakdown of civil government. There is not a security that was established for liberty of speech, writing, or motion which has not been swept away."[13]

England's attention was called to the failure of Northern citizens to fill draft quotas and their protests against suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus* under authority of the Secretary of War. Their indignation was believed to explain Republican losses at the polls in the autumn of 1862.[14]

Northern criticism of Lincoln and lack of confidence in the Union armies were continually heralded abroad. In January, 1863, Englishmen read in the *Times* a quotation from the *New York Journal of Commerce* stating that if there were a "constitutional method of compelling the resignation of the President and Vice President and replacing Lincoln, the people would employ it."[15] In the *New York Tribune* Horace Greeley advocated a European power be invited to mediate between the Confederacy and the Union.[16] On the floor of the American House of Representatives Congressman Vallandigham of Ohio urged the North to give up. "Stop fighting," he said. "Make an armistice. Accept at once friendly foreign mediation."[17]

British suspicion of Northern designs on Canada was intensified by such events as Secretary of State Seward's appeal in October, 1861, asking state officials to bolster the Great Lakes and Maritime defenses. One English writer later warned that Seward was trying to construct a plausible ground of quarrel with Great Britain in order that the Union armies might indemnify the United States at the end of the Civil War by conquering Canada.[18] The *Brighton Observer* said, "the Yankees . . . have licked their lying lips at the prospect of annexing Canada. . . ."[19]

[12] Ephraim Douglass Adams, *Great Britain and the American Civil War* (New York, 1925), II, 300.
[13] *Times*, Dec. 11, 1861.
[14] Rhodes, IV, 164-165.
[15] *Times*, Jan. 2, 1863.
[16] *New York Tribune*, Jan. 14, 1863.
[17] Rhodes, IV, 226-227.
[18] Jordan and Pratt, pp. 27-28.
[19] Quoted by Gow, p. 21.

## III

Deprived of the columns of many influential newspapers, the pro-Northern movement in England was forced to rely heavily upon the spoken word to sway British opinion. It found its most valuable channels of communication in the popular platform and the Nonconformist pulpit. Its speakers addressed public assemblies, rallies of workingmen, audiences of labor unions, religious gatherings, and meetings of societies advocating abolition, women's rights, antivivisection, free thought, atheism, and secularism.

Most of the English speakers in the pro-Northern movement were men of little more than local reputation. Among public men of the first rank John Bright and Richard Cobden stood virtually alone in pleading the Union's case and allaying the antagonism that flared up in late 1861 following the halting of the British mail steamer *Trent* on the high seas by an American naval vessel and the seizure of two Confederate agents en route to Europe.[20]

To promote public meetings, publish tracts, and co-ordinate the pro-Northern movement, organizations were formed in several communities during the second year of the war. Most important among them were the London Emancipation Society, organized in November, 1862, and the Union and Emancipation Society of Manchester, established at the close of that year under the leadership and with the financial assistance of a local magnate, Thomas Bayley Potter. The latter group during its three years of activity sponsored hundreds of meetings in England and Scotland and distributed hundreds of thousands of antislavery tracts and pamphlets containing the texts of pro-Northern speeches. Committees of the society were formed in more than forty communities to carry on the campaign locally.[21]

In their attempt to shatter the Confederate arguments, the pro-Northern speakers spoke almost as one man. Although their rhetorical methods ranged from the calm and penetrating analyses of Handel Cossham and John Elliott Cairnes to the ardent appeals of Dan Gow and the Reverend Baptist Noel, they were united in their insistence that Secession was a lawless insurrection to perpetuate slavery.

In a demolishing attack on Secession at a public dinner in Rochdale on December 4, 1861, John Bright insisted that the main issue of the struggle was not Southern independence, nor tariff, nor anything but slavery. The conscience of the Northern states, he declared, was "never satisfied with the institution" and they "now stand before the world the advocates and defenders of freedom and civilization." "The Slave States," he went on, "offer themselves for the recognition of Christian nations, based upon . . . the unchangeable foundation in their eyes, of slavery and barbarism. . . . I say that slavery has sought to break up the most free government in the world, and to found a new State, in this 19th century, whose corner stone is the perpetual bondage of millions of men."[22]

To show that the Southern states had little ground for claiming their voice to have been ignored, and Secession to have been forced upon them, Bright traced the course of Southern influence in the Federal Government. The South had enjoyed an excess of representation, he pointed out, through the practice of counting as three citizens every five slaves whenever Congressional seats were

[20] For an account of this episode, see Jordan and Pratt, p. 28.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

[22] *Times*, Dec. 6, 1861.

apportioned. For thirty-two of the first thirty-six years after formation of the Union every President was a Southern man; and from 1828 until 1860 the South voted with the majority in every Presidential election. But its reverses in the 1860 election were followed instantly by Secession, insurrection, and war. The object of the South is this—to escape from the majority who wish to limit the area of slavery.

Bright hailed America as "the transatlantic English nation, the inheritor and partaker of the historic glories of this country." Appealing to his listeners' sense of duty and honor, he denied that Great Britain could absolve itself of partial responsibility for the war. He quoted Thomas Jefferson's complaint two years before the Declaration of Independence that the British Government had refused to stop the overseas slave trade as the colonies requested in a preliminary attempt to abolish slavery itself within their borders. He said, "we are as much interested in the crisis nearly as if I were making this speech in the city of Boston or New York."[23]

Bright also castigated the English advocates of peace in America at the cost of division of the nation. "I want to know," he asked, "whether it has ever been admitted by politicians and statesmen or by any people that great nations can be broken up at any time by the will of any particular section of those nations?" He challenged anyone to find a feasible borderline between North and South. Reminding his audience that several states along the Mason-Dixon line were slave states but had voted for the Union, he said there was probably "no country in the world . . . where any plan of separation . . . as far as the question of boundary is concerned is so surrounded with insurmountable difficulties."[24]

The pro-Southern Englishmen's demand for "peace at any price" was also attacked in the Nonconformist pulpits of England. In a sermon based on the Twentieth Psalm, addressed to his London congregation on December 21, 1861, the Reverend Alfred C. Thomas explained that it was the North's duty to fight and that England should grant its moral support to the struggle for reunion. "I would awaken your prayerful sympathy for a people contending for an established government. Civil government is a divine institution. . . . To submit to all and every attack made upon its principles and authority without repudiation and resistance—armed resistance if necessary—is cowardice. . . ."[25]

Denying the right of a state to secede, Thomas said: "States are sovereign only in their own territorial jurisdiction but not sovereign at all in regard to matters of national legislation. Nor is the Union a Union simply of States, but of the whole American people. The Union arose at the voice of the national will, and can be modified or destroyed only by the concurrence of that national will. . . . Its Constitution is drawn up in the name of the people, not of the *States*, and begins, '*We, the people,' &c.*, not '*We, the States.*'"[26]

Christopher Newman Hall, a popular Nonconformist pastor credited with having influenced William Gladstone and other members of Parliament, answered pro-Southern contentions in his speech to an assembly of London workingmen on October 20, 1862, three days before the British cabinet was scheduled to

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] *Ibid.*

[25] Alfred C. Thomas, *Prayerful Sympathy Invoked for America* (Philadelphia, 1863), pp. 8-9.

[26] *Ibid.* p. 9.

meet. Chastising the Confederacy as a slavocracy, he said the South had no more right to secede than had Yorkshire. Because the Secessionists' real motivation was the desire to continue slavery, England, in keeping with her traditions, must perforce sympathize with the North.[27]

The pro-Northern speakers described the moral and material superiority of the North, indicating both its capacity and worthiness for ultimate victory. They told their audiences that the Confederacy rather than the Union was the destroyer of freedom and international harmony.

Dan Gow, in a lecture sponsored by the Lancashire Relief Fund on November 24, 1862, in Forest Hill, described the unparalleled resources of the North and the flourishing of education and religion and of "arts and sciences . . . that have originated . . . wonderful inventions." It is, he said, *"there and there alone,* that freedom of speech and of the press have been secured and order and loyalty always prevailed." "Now, in the States of the South," he declared, "you have just the reverse. . . ." The gospel "is changed into . . . a hateful slave-code, making the free and bountiful earth a prison-house. . . . It is long since freedom of discussion on any question regarding Slavery would have been tolerated in the South. Travellers who have given expression to Anti-Slavery opinions have been seized by the mob. . . . When Kansas was in the hands of the slaveholders, it was enacted that advocacy of Anti-Slavery opinions should be treated as felony. . . ."[28]

The cause of the North was the cause of freedom and harmony between nations, said Handel Cossham, leader of local Radicalism, in his speech on February 12, 1864, at Bristol. He compared the political record of North and South to reveal that the Northern policy had been the more beneficent and the less belligerent of the two. Praising the Union's policy of "trade with all, but alliance with none," he said that "any aggressive policy that has been developed in the history of America, such as the dishonest annexation of Texas and the conduct of the American Government toward Mexico, has been the result of Southern and not Northern policy."[29]

He predicted that Confederate victory would lead inevitably to Southern demands for territorial expansion because "Slavery so impoverishes a country that it needs a constant accession of land." That the future prosperity of England would be best assured by Northern success was made clear in his description of the contagious backward economy of slave states. "The savage and the slave require but little of the commerce of the world to supply their wants. . . . We want more customers for our manufactures. . . ." To get them "we must increase our markets by promoting a higher civilization and a higher social status."[30]

He said many citizens of the South were opposed to Secession and slavery. Since they as well as the millions of negroes would be benefited by reunion and emancipation, there remained but a small proportion of the inhabitants of America who would not profit after a Northern victory.[31]

## IV

During the first three months of 1863 a wave of public meetings sponsored by the pro-Union societies aroused an im-

[27] Jay Monaghan, *Diplomat in Carpet Slippers* (Indianapolis, 1945), p. 257; Jordan and Pratt, p. 40.
[28] Gow, p. 8.
[29] Handel Cossham, *The American War: Facts and Fallacies* (New York, 1865), pp. 15-16.
[30] *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

pressive crescendo of popular acclaim. The putting into effect of President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation on January 1 enabled the pro-Northern movement in England at last to make a truly effective use of its strongest appeal, the slavery issue. Prior to that time the lack of a clear announcement by the Union against the existence of slavery caused many Englishmen, as we have seen, to believe that the North was fighting merely to dominate the South. But once the freedom of the slaves was officially decreed, the pro-Northern movement was able to make a convincing bid for the support of all antislavery people in Great Britain. In retaliation the pro-Confederate movement denounced the Proclamation as a vicious, inhuman, and insincere act, which was not motivated by sympathy for the slaves but by a desire to cause a negro uprising in the South. The *Times* indeed had stated late in 1862 that "Mr. Lincoln will, on the 1st of next January, do his best to excite a servile war in the States which he cannot occupy with his armies. . . . He will appeal to the black blood of Africans . . . whisper of the pleasures of the spoil and of gratification of yet fiercer instincts."[32]

Mass meetings marking the advent of Emancipation in America attracted large audiences in London, Manchester, and other cities on December 31 and January 1. The speakers lauded the Emancipation Proclamation as an announcement which proved that the North was entitled to the support of all enemies of human bondage. In Dissenting churches at the same time prayers and sermons asked divine blessing on the Union in its effort to eradicate slavery.

England's greatest antislavery orator, George Thompson, reported that he addressed a crowded assembly of unemployed textile workers at Heywood and "spoke to them for two hours about the Slaveholders' Rebellion." "They were united and vociferous," he said, "in the expression of their willingness to suffer all hardships consequent upon a want of cotton" to promote the cause of freedom.[33]

Five weeks later Thompson wrote of having participated in meetings in twenty-one English and Scottish cities. They were "densely crowded, sublimely enthusiastic, and all but unanimous." One held at Stroud "did not conclude until midnight." Another near his residence attracted thousands more than the capacity of the hall. An overflow meeting was held outside and "addressed by competent persons." He added that "the cheers raised by the multitude found their way into the meeting I was addressing, and increased the excitement of my audience."[34]

One of the largest pro-Northern demonstrations was the mass meeting held by the London Emancipation Society at Exeter Hall on January 29, 1863. Two overflow meetings were necessary to accommodate the ten thousand persons who attended. A telegram was read announcing that four thousand people were assembled simultaneously in Bradford at another meeting in support of the North. Response to the speeches was enthusiastic. The name of Lincoln brought the listeners to their feet, cheering and waving hats and handkerchiefs. They hissed at the mention of Jefferson Davis.[35]

Turning the tables on those who had branded the Proclamation as barbaric, the Exeter Hall keynote speaker, a Dissenting minister, the Reverend Baptist

[32] *Times*, Oct. 7, 1862.

[33] Frederick John Shaw and W. H. Chesson, *Anglo-American Relations, 1861-1865* (New York, 1920), p. 110.

[34] *Ibid.*, pp. 109-110.

[35] *Times*, Jan. 30, 1863.

Noel, charged that it was not Lincoln but the Confederates who had defied "the moral sense of civilized mankind." He cited recently reported atrocities and explained Jefferson Davis' "murder policy" and "preterhuman thirst for blood" as evinced in his hint that slaveholders would kill negro men, women, and children if the slaves attempted to put the Emancipation into effect.[36]

Reminding his listeners that the pro-Southern press sneered at them as "a few insignificant . . . 'nobodies'" who were not representative of the English people, Noel asked them to voice their antislavery principles through the length and breadth of the land. Let there be everywhere such an echo of them, he urged, that no man in his senses can any longer pretend that England favors slavery.[37]

That the pro-Union sympathy expressed at the meeting was representative of the English people, though not of the Church of England or the nobility, was the opinion of the London *Daily News*. But the *Saturday Review*, the *Times*, and the *Weekly Dispatch* denied that the meeting reflected the prevailing sentiment of English commoners.

More than forty public meetings were held in cities of England and Scotland in February of 1863, and they continued with nearly the same frequency in March and April. At Liverpool, a "hotbed of Southern sympathies," between three and four thousand people assembled on February 19 to hail the Union cause. A singular feature of the movement there was the active participation of Church of England ministers.[38]

Perhaps the climax of the pro-Northern demonstrations was the great rally of London Trades Unions in St. James Hall on March 26. In the keynote speech John Bright shifted from defense of the North to an attack upon British "privilege," which he accused of aiding the Confederacy in hope that the Union would crumble as a demonstration of the failure of its democratic experiment.[39]

Cheers interrupted him continually as he went on: "Privilege has shuddered at what might happen to old Europe if this grand experiment should succeed. But you, the workers,—you, striving after a better time,—you, struggling upwards toward the light with slow and painful steps,—you have no cause to look with jealousy upon a country which, among the nations of the globe, is that one where labor has met with the highest honour, and where it has reached its greatest reward."[40]

He reminded them that a loan of three million pounds had recently been negotiated in London to enable the Confederacy "to pay in this country for vessels that are being built here—for other *Alabamas*, from which it is hoped that so much irritation will arise in the minds of the people in the Northern States that even yet England may be plunged into war, and be made to appear to take sides with the South and with slavery."[41]

During the wave of mass meetings held in January, February, and March of 1863 it was known to a small number of American officials that a Birkenhead shipyard was building for indirect delivery to the South two 230-foot ironclad vessels, each capable of even greater destruction than the *Alabama* had wrought. Known as the Laird Rams, their equipment included a seven-foot underwater "piercer" at the prow for sinking the wooden ships blockading Southern ports. To evade existing

[36] *Ibid.*
[37] *Ibid.*
[38] Jordan and Pratt, pp. 151-153
[39] *Times*, Mar. 27, 1863.
[40] *Ibid.*
[41] *Ibid.*

British neutrality laws their destination had been adroitly concealed.

In March the fight to stop construction of such vessels for the South became intense. The Union's diplomatic corps, friends in Parliament, and special emissaries worked, though not always in unison, to bring about the seizure of all warships intended for the Confederate Navy. On March 27, the day following the St. James Hall rally, John Bright called Parliament's attention to the growing popular desire for a friendlier Government policy toward the Union. Demanding that the Government categorically "prevent the sailing of these vessels," he said: "If you had last night looked in the faces of 3,000 of the most intelligent of the artisan class in London, as I did, and heard their cheers and observed their sympathy for that country for which you appear to care so little, you would imagine that the conduct of the Government, the more forbearing, the more generous, the more just it was toward the United States, the more it would recommend itself to the magnanimous feeling of the people of this country."[42]

The Government subsequently adopted a more favorable policy towards the North; and it became publicly known in September of 1863 when Earl Russell placed the vessels under official surveillance and ordered Laird Brothers not to release the Rams even on a trial run. Russell did not ask for formal cabinet approval of his order. There are indications that the shift in policy leading to the order and later seizure of the Rams had occurred in the spring, and that final action was delayed to enable the gathering of evidence. Holding that "the real crisis of Governmental decision to act came in April," and that "events in September were but final applications of that decision," Professor E. D. Adams explains that Russell required the intervening time for his attempt to elicit from Laird Brothers sufficient evidence for a conviction. Russell wrote to Lairds as if a decision had not been reached and did not place the restriction on movement of the Rams until September 9, the day after the correspondence came to a head, with Laird's refusal to give information, although on September 1 Russell had already directed that steps be taken for detention of the Rams and on September 5 had assured Washington that the vessels would be seized.[43]

Whether the Government reached its decision to stop the further supply of warships for the South in April, as Adams maintains, or not until summer, when Union military successes made it clear that the North was rapidly gaining the upper hand, there can be no doubt that the expression of popular will aroused by the English speakers for the North was a potent factor in compelling a decisive shift to an official policy which was favorable to the Union and improved diplomatic relations between Great Britain and the United States.

Important as was the contribution of American speakers to the pro-Northern movement in England, the pro-Northern English speakers had already won their case before the Americans appeared. Of course, they outnumbered the Americans, and they had the advantage of a more intimate knowledge of British attitudes on social and political issues; and thus were able more easily to state their case persuasively and establish close rapport with particular audiences. As another important advantage, they were less likely than were

[42] *Times*, Mar. 28, 1863; C. F. Adams, pp. 361-364.

[43] E. D. Adams, II, 144-147.

the American speakers to be suspected of being professional propagandists[44] or distorted in their judgment by patriotic or emotional motives. These advantages tended to offset the superior ethical appeal that the American speakers enjoyed in their obvious firsthand knowledge of American affairs.

The pro-Northern English speakers were active from the early months of the Civil War to the cessation of hostilities. From the beginning of 1862 to the end of the war they spoke at no less than five hundred meetings in England and Scotland, with the majority in London and the Lancashire manufacturing districts.[45] The year 1863, which in British-American relations was the most crucial of the war, witnessed their greatest effort and accomplishment. After 1863, as the pro-Confederate movement persistently offered strong opposition, notably through the columns of the *Times*, the pro-Northern movement continued its activity and held numerous public meetings, though with less frequency than in 1863. It kept alive the enthusiasm of its adherents, won new supporters, and continued to voice a resounding protest against any shift of Government policy favorable to the South.

In acknowledging the profound influence of the pro-Northern English speakers upon British-American relations, Richard Cobden praised Thomas Bayley Potter for his able leadership of the Union and Emancipation Society, which sponsored more pro-Northern English speakers than any other organization, and said that he had "done more than any man in England to produce that reaction in public opinion in favour of the North which had so salutary an effect on the tone of our parliamentary politicians."[46]

[44] Rhodes, IV, 353, 357. C. F. Adams, aware of the British suspicion of outside influence in domestic affairs and of the hint in the *Times* that the Union had provided funds through Adams to stimulate the January 29 rally at Exeter Hall, reported to Seward that it was necessary to take "no part whatsoever" in promoting popular support for the Union. He warned that the slightest suspicion of his encouragement of pro-Union meetings "would do more harm than good."

[45] E. D. Adams, II, 223; Rhodes, IV, 350-353.

[46] Shaw and Chesson, p. 101.

## AMERICAN LITERATURE

On literary subjects the Americans are in the *shadow* of the English. As we derived our origin from Great Britain, so, from her, we draw our opinions, our tastes, our associations, our *literature*. A British tinge pervades our novels, British periodicals, in too many instances, are supported by us, in preference to our own. If the latter are inferior, that is the most effectual way to keep them so; or, if not, to prevent their being profitable and durable. The public, from *patriotic* motives should make it the interest of publishers to issue *American* works; by extending to all, worthy of such a compliment, a prompt and efficient encouragement; and the press should greet a good native production with more attention and care. It is a curious fact, that, at this moment, an American will probably find a better market for a valuable manuscript in London than in his own country.

*New-York Mirror*, XI (August 3, 1833), 40.

# IS ORATORY A LOST ART?

Harold P. Zelko

A RECENT article by Max Eastman deploring the fact that you "rarely hear a man described as an orator these days" has received much attention both from students of speechmaking and the general public.[1] Not realizing that his words might be taken quite critically by the former group, Mr. Eastman advanced a number of misconceptions about good speech today, and these need to be corrected. This paper attempts to point them out and to state a more critical conception of the good public speech than Mr. Eastman has done.

Mr. Eastman's thesis can be summarized as follows: there are no great orators any more, and the very idea of oratory is dying out. For this decline he finds three causes. One is the microphone, which roots a speaker to one spot on the platform, thus preventing him from walking about, and thus also encouraging him to read his words from manuscript rather than to deliver them from memory. Another cause is the idea that oratory is a matter of "inspiration," not of hard work, of memory-training, of careful premeditation. And the third cause is the modern preference for slow rather than rapid speaking.

In defense of these points, Mr. Eastman takes us from Demosthenes—whom he quotes as declaring that good oratory has three essentials, "action, action, and action"—through Patrick Henry, Daniel Webster, Henry Ward Beecher, and Robert Ingersoll to Winston Churchill, who is "our sole surviving orator." He develops his points in a disarming, light, anecdotal manner, chiefly around such examples as these, yet with an air of seriousness to suggest that he is striding outside his well-known position as a humorist. Perhaps he did not intend his argument to be taken too strictly. But still there are a number of hidden inconsistencies in it, one of which is his plea for a great deal of action and movement on the part of the orator and his later advocacy of Churchill, who of recent years has not been a speaker with a great deal of action.

Actually most of our profession would also include Churchill as a great speaker. This fact emphasizes that some of our differences with Mr. Eastman might be purely a matter of semantics, for whether we call a person who communicates well with an audience a "great orator" or a "good speaker" does not matter as long as we are talking about the same thing. Churchill happens to do most of his speaking into a microphone, he reaches his height when inspired, and he speaks at a moderately slow rate. But if he is still a great orator in Mr. Eastman's mind, while doing these things, it is hard for us to reconcile this judgment with other aspects of Mr. Eastman's argument.

First we might agree that there is no one best way to be an effective speaker. Yet most of us accept certain basic standards that a good speech must have. Mr. Eastman's complaint that we do not have great orators today is based on his own estimate of what makes today's

*Harold P. Zelko is Professor of Public Speaking at The Pennsylvania State University.*

[1] Max Eastman, "The Lost Art of Oratory," *The Saturday Review*, March 6, 1954, and *The Reader's Digest*, March 1954.

speaker good, and herein lie the issues. It is my belief that there are many good speakers today (regardless of what they are called); that our present standards of good speech have evolved in our society out of broad and significant circumstances which are quite different from those of the days of the so-called "great orators"; that good speeches are both prepared and "inspired"; that the microphone need not be a major handicap; that "slow" speaking is not necessarily a part of our present conception of the good speech; and that memorizing is not necessarily the way to bring about effective speaking or anything else which we might call good oral communication. These beliefs amount to an acknowledgement that extemporaneous speaking as it is practiced today is better, for our contemporary requirements, than the more formal styles that Mr. Eastman considers to be the only true specimens of oratory.

In trying to assess our present leaders in public life to determine where they belong in the class of good speakers, I would have to say that we have many men who perhaps should be named along with Churchill as our "surviving orators." They include Alben Barkley, Adlai Stevenson, Eric Johnston, Thomas Dewey, and the versatile Norman Thomas. Any such selection will of course arouse controversy, but I am thinking here of men who can speak well from manuscript, and who retain some of the qualities of Eastman's orators, while they also use (or are confronted by) some of the things that in his view preclude great oratory. We have other leading speakers who are exceedingly effective in extemporizing, and we may doubt whether they are to be excluded from the category of orators. Some of these are Harry Truman, Wayne Morse, Dwight and Milton Eisenhower, and Senator A. S. Mike Monroney.

The question whether oratory is a lost art really boils down to what we want to see in today's effective speaker. Eastman defines this art thus: "Oratory is at best a dramatic art; it is the art of speaking lines you have written and acting the part yourself." I submit that if this is an accurate definition of "oratory," it is *not* a definition of effective speaking as we presently regard it. And I believe that this is why we do not refer to good speakers today as orators. What we are after is not dramatics, not an art in the strict sense of the word, and surely not acting.

There are some rather fundamental concepts of our democratic society that cannot be ignored in trying to characterize our speaking. As our nation (and the world) have grown into what we like to feel is a more democratic society, the average man has become a more active participant in the world about him. He is better informed, more widely read, and better able to think through the problems of the day. He is more respected by his superiors in the place where he works; he is given more credit for his judgment by his fellow citizens; and *he is recognized as a thinking person by those who speak to him.* If we compare him with his counterpart in the days of Patrick Henry, Daniel Webster, and other famous orators of our national history, we find him to surpass his predecessors in the knowledge of public affairs. Moreover, he is a better speaker than his counterpart. Today's average man belongs to business men's clubs, church and social organizations, professional societies, and political groups, where he frequently is in the role of speaker and participant. Yes, he even attends courses in effective speaking, or his employer gives him training

in speech to improve his oral communication for the needs of business.

In the days of Patrick Henry we had few such average men. Being less informed and in a position to hear a speaker only on rare occasions, the citizen of those days liked something quite out of the ordinary when he heard a speech. Speaking was to him an "event" perhaps long anticipated, as it later was in the lecturing days of Robert Ingersoll. There were fewer things to do, fewer forms of entertainment, fewer opportunities for the excitement now provided by organized sports, the movies, and television. The speaker was respected for his knowledge, and indeed his knowledge was far in excess of that of his listeners. And so in talking to audiences he was more dogmatic, more dramatic, more bombastic, more embellished in his style and manner, and more fervent and loud, partly because of the physical problem of being heard, and partly to demonstrate his superior position.

Contrast this with today's speaker. He is aware of the fact that his listeners are more enlightened, that they like to think through the subject with the speaker; and he has a healthy respect for their ability to do this. And so he is not the dogmatic flamboyant dramatic spellbinder of a past day. Rather he is one "average man" talking to another, poised, confident, direct, and animated. His manner is conversational, his communication is direct, his expression and gesture are natural, and he is *never acting a part*. Actually, he is talking over the subject *with* his listeners rather than talking *to* or *at* them. We therefore describe the effective speaking manner of today's speaker as one of "enlarged conversation." This does not mean that on occasion today's manner might not be quite forceful or involve sweeping gesture or have vivid style of language or otherwise possess some of the characteristics of the "lost art of oratory." But it is exceedingly important to recognize the fundamental distinction that today's speaker is a socially minded participant in a democratic society, and thus puts himself on a par with his audience, as compared to the "orator" who puts himself somewhat aside from (if not above) his audience.

It is interesting to note that the microphone of which Mr. Eastman complains has been a chief factor in educating the average man and in contributing to the "leveling-off process" between speaker and audience. True, the microphone does impose certain limiting factors on the activity of the speaker. But the implication in Mr. Eastman's point that speakers should be free to roam and rant upon the platform is a dangerous one. All of us want to see an animated, lively, energetic speaker. But he can show every evidence of this within a few feet of a microphone. Actually if the "pacers" and "walkers" whom Mr. Eastman talks about would stand still and use the same amount of energy in talking directly to their listeners, they would be much more effective, in my opinion.

Mr. Eastman points out that nobody "is going to memorize an oration in order to stand stock-still and recite it into a microphone." Of course not. Who wants a speaker to *memorize* anything . . . or *recite* it? Let the actor memorize his lines exactly as the author wrote them; and let the child recite his verse; but let's keep our speakers *talking things over with us* and not just reeling off so many words from a memorized page in a singsong voice and manner. Memorized singsong is something we have to resist in trying to teach individ-

uals to stand on their feet and speak what they're thinking. Yet after working almost through an entire course, a very timid young lady who was just getting some confidence in her ability to think and speak suddenly did an about-face and went to the platform and "recited" a memorized speech. Obviously she was very ineffective, and, when I asked why she did these things, her reply was that she had read Mr. Eastman's article, and that he had said good speeches should be memorized!

It is true that the microphone and the "business" of today's life have brought about a trend toward the written speech read from manuscript and frequently not prepared by the speaker. I hold no brief for this, and I abhor this kind of speaking perhaps even more than does Mr. Eastman. There is little excuse for most speakers today to justify this reading from manuscript by saying that they are either too busy to prepare their own speeches or that they hold a position so important as to require them to "be very careful how they are quoted." Except for a very few high government officials, all such "important" speakers would do well to learn to extemporize. And for those who must read their speeches, this too can be done well, as Churchill and Roosevelt bear distinguished witness.

I am not sure what Mr. Eastman means when he says that a "more subtle foe of great oratory . . . is our 'inspirational' conception of it." He points out that truly great orations are studiously composed well in advance of the occasion and that their greatness is due more to the hard labor in preparation than to the inspiration of the occasion. This may be true; and it is indeed a hard factor to measure. We know that great speeches stem from a speaker responding to a subject, to an occasion, and to listeners in such a way as to transcend ordinary responses. Which of these elements contributes most in a given case is difficult to determine. The fact that we regard the occasion as an important part of the speaking situation, from which the speaker may become more "inspired" in one case than another, is not to deplore this as a contributing factor. The concept of occasion does not mean that merely out of a particular occasion a speaker may rise and be so inspired as to be great without any thoughtful preparation. Under certain unusual circumstances greatness may proceed from occasion alone, but usually preparation is also involved.

Webster's famous "Reply to Hayne" was seemingly inspired by the occasion; yet he later said that he had been preparing the speech for thirty years. Patrick Henry's historic "Liberty or Death" came from an inspired speaker who rose to his greatest height on the occasion at hand, but surely he spoke after preparation. But the wording of his speech as it has come down to us is based upon the reports of witnesses, not upon an original surviving text. Franklin Roosevelt's first inaugural, in which occurred the famous line, "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself," had inspiration from the times, but it too was prepared. In fact, all of these speeches, because of the inspiration of the time, became greater than they would have been. But there is no substitute for adequate preparation to bring about good speaking; let there be no quarrel about that. Preparation should be done, however, within the framework of the steps for developing an *extemporaneous* speech, as all of us know them.

We should also remember that the good extemporizer regards his listener as an intelligent person who is thinking out the ideas with him. Such a speaker is

confident, direct, animated, and energetic; but he is never aloof, distant, artificial, insincere, or acting a part.

In Mr. Eastman's article, there is just one other point that deserves comment. He points out a current "notion" that today's speaker feels more impressive when he speaks slowly, even to a point of inserting some "urs" to "suggest heavy meditation." I do not know where Mr. Eastman got the notion that this is a current vogue or something to be desired in a speaker. Certainly I do not know of such a vogue, and I agree fully that slow speaking for its own sake should not be done. But to counter this, Mr. Eastman suggests that the speaker should actually compel himself to talk fast in order to keep the audience and the speaker awake. Now, knowing full well Mr. Eastman's reputation and ability in the field of humor, I admit that he may mean this suggestion in jest; but I am inclined to believe he is serious. If so, it is unusual that he should mention rate of speed in speaking in preference to so many other factors of equal importance. But I would say both to the very slow and the very fast speakers, "A plague o' both your houses!" The effective speaker will use an average rate and will vary it in the direction of slow and fast depending on the meaning to be conveyed and the audience to be addressed. He will use a rate dictated by his sense of the rate of comprehension of the audience.

Another important point is that good speakers are not conscious of technique while making speeches; they are simply interested in the best possible communication in the given situation.

When I compare Mr. Eastman's position with that which I've tried to set forth, I'm sure that he and I are both interested in the same thing. Neither of us would condone the sloppy, indirect, indifferent, mumbling speaker. We are both looking for the poised, confident, sincere, animated individual who talks to us as though he means what he's saying and knows how to say it. That there are many such speakers in our democracy, I have no doubt. But that we should ever want to return to "the lost art of oratory" is something which I would want to deny . . . in either Max Eastman's manner or my own . . . and I believe that he too would want to deny it, if he really thought the matter out.

## BUNKER'S HILL

The anniversary of the battle of Bunker's Hill, was celebrated at Charlestown, Massachusetts, on the seventeenth of June, with unusual "pomp and circumstance." Alexander H. Everett delivered an oration, which is praised for its anecdote and its eloquence, although it lasted two hours and a half. Thirteen revolutionary veterans were present, ten of whom were at the identical battle. In the course of the oration another of such "dumb mouths" as Antony terms the rents in Caesar's mantle, produced a great sensation. The very ball which killed General Warren was exhibited by Mr. Everett, wrapped in a piece of paper stained with Warren's blood! It was taken from the hero's body by Mr. Savage, on the day after the battle.

*New-York Mirror*, XVI (July 23, 1836), 32.

# PLURALISM IN THE INTERPRETER'S SEARCH FOR SANCTIONS

Don Geiger

## I

THE oral interpreter's interest in literary theory is not unlike that of any other student of literature. Ideally, all special approaches to literary art would derive their sanctions from an indisputable theory of its nature, function, and value. In fact, however, most specialists probably give up, if they have ever been tempted by, theoretical speculation. The biographer continues to investigate Melville's real financial situation; the psychologist tries to find out just which obsession Yeats really had; the philosophical critic tests the "ideas" of literature; the formalist critic keeps on studying the art of the poems; and the oral interpreter goes right on reading them aloud.

However regrettable this may be, it is not surprising that literary theory has not more definitely directed these various specialties or more certainly determined the hierarchy of their importance. The theorist must deal with a host of indeterminately related facts of both readers' and writers' experience of literature and must account for literature's many aspects. As I. A. Richards suggests, the facts for which the theorist must account perhaps pour in on him "too abundantly," presenting him with "'more warmth than Adam needs!'"[1]

So, too, we must often feel like complaining of the overabundance of speculation about literature: "Criticism in our time is a sort of tower of Babel."[2] Nevertheless, literary theory can probably reward us richly in understanding if we approach it with proper respect for its intricacies.

There are in general two possible approaches to literary theories. First, one may treat them simply as rivals of one another, all in strict competition. The chief danger inherent in this attitude is that it may lead, in the philosophic terms of Elder Olson, to "dogmatism," which "holds the truth of a single position and the falsity, in some degree at least, of all others."

The major alternative to this view is "pluralism," the belief that there is a "plurality of valid philosophies." According to this view, one acknowledges competitive aspects but also regards literary theory broadly as a co-operative enterprise. That is, the pluralist believes that "the diverse may be contradictory or not; theories of criticism which are not contradictory or incompatible may be translated into one another, and a just decision may be given between those which are really contradictory, provided that we can isolate the differences of formulation from the differences of truths and falsities."[3]

It is the burden of this paper to suggest that the pluralist approach is nec-

*Don Geiger (Ph.D., Northwestern, 1951) is Assistant Professor of Speech at University of California at Berkeley. He is a frequent contributor of poetry and essays to speech and literary journals.*

[1] I. A. Richards, *Principles of Literary Criticism* (New York, 1949), p. 5.

[2] Elder Olson, "An Outline of Poetic Theory," *Critics and Criticism*, ed. R. S. Crane (Chicago, 1952), p. 546.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 547.

essary for a correct assessment of existent similarities and differences between literary theories.

I can think of no better means of accomplishing this than by turning attention to a recent essay by Mr. Robert Marsh,[4] which was based on an approach very different from the one I am recommending here. Although I welcome that essay as an augmentation to dramatic theory, the interesting and valuable Aristotelian interpretation offered in it does not presently concern me. Instead I am interested in the kind of analysis which Mr. Marsh makes of theories other than the Aristotelian theory, of which he approves. His analysis is so pervasively competitive that it offers a signal opportunity to notice certain unnecessary limitations which I take to be inevitable in viewing literary theory as a competitive venture.

As one of the intended victims of Mr. Marsh's polemic, I am admittedly eager to dull the edge of the murder weapon. But my analysis has the broader aim of seeking to show that only a very different approach from Mr. Marsh's, one that is pluralistic in intent, is capable of gaining a really precise sense of the differences between theories (paradoxical as that may seem), just as it is more obviously capable of fully recognizing similarities between theories.

I should perhaps emphasize that I am analyzing a certain approach to theory and do not intend anything like an attack on Aristotle or his interpreters. In fact, my suggestion for a proper approach to a study of literary theory derives from a group of Aristotelian critics whose work is directly relevant to Mr. Marsh's concerns. I refer of course to the "Chicago school." Mr. Marsh's interpretation of what Aristotle might think of the nature of a lyric poem bears a more certain resemblance to that of this group (with their considerable interest in short or lyric poems, and the criticism thereof) than it does to other Aristotelian interpretation. Also the interest which Mr. Marsh takes in other theories—his distress with "discourse," "attitudes," "extrinsic" approaches—so echoes the disturbance of R. S. Crane, Elder Olson, and Norman MacLean that we can hardly resist comparison.

What follows, then, may be seen as an application of the comment by one of the best known members of this school, Mr. Crane, that the "pluralistic" approach would appear to be "the only satisfactory approach to the existing diversities of criticism."[5]

I shall consider five of what I take to be the most important propositions about "diversities" in literary theories. I shall seek to show that to regard theories as in simple competition with one another is inevitably to fail to understand their relations, and that a pluralist approach is necessary to our precise understanding of them.

## II

*1. Theories may differ in the aspects of literature which they explain.*

The theories of the Public Censor and the "pure" esthete are broad examples. The Censor (in our caricature of him which he often approximates in fact) finds nothing in literature but illustrations of moral or immoral behavior; the pure esthete finds nothing but well-developed or fractured forms.

Often enough there is no real cause for a quarrel between the spokesmen for such varied theories. They are simply considering different aspects, and

[4] Robert Marsh, "Aristotle and the Modern Rhapsode," *QJS*, XXXIX (December 1953), 491-498.

[5] R. S. Crane, "Introduction," *Critics and Criticism*, p. 9.

their various explanations may all be necessary to a fully developed theory of literature. For example, to most disinterested observers it seems evident that a comprehensive theory must account for both a formal and an ideational or moral aspect in literature.

Perhaps most frequently, however, theories bear a more complicated relation to one another. In part, they "compete" by offering different explanations of some aspect; and only in part are they simply concerned with different aspects.

The pluralist, while recognizing areas of contention, or differences of opinion, also recognizes the simple differences of interest. Thus the pluralist can, without distortion, preserve a true sense of the differences and similarities between various speculations.

However, if the student insists on the simple differences between theories, he approaches them in a different manner from that of the pluralist. He first seizes on some point of real difference between his favorite theory and some other. Then he decides this difference in favor of his approved theory, usually without hinting that the other theory may valuably concern itself with other aspects. Instead he is tempted into implying that the other theory, only some of whose elements he is actually disputing, is simply "wrong."

This competitive pattern is, I think, almost perfectly represented in Mr. Marsh's arguments against theories which assume "that all poems are direct speaker-to-audience communication,"[6] or "communication between author and audience."[7] Mr. Marsh feels that these theories fail to account for certain facts concerning the subject matter and presentation of, at least, a lyric poem. Such a poem is instead, he thinks, "a mode of imitation in the dramatic manner, with a human action as its object."[8] Succinctly, "the lyric is a dramatic form of imitated action."[9]

Surely the oral interpreter, confronted always with the problem of characterizing the "speaker" of a poem, must applaud defenses like this of the "dramatic form" of the lyric. But also the oral interpreter, as keenly aware as anyone of what an audience can "get" from literature, must be disturbed by Mr. Marsh's minimizing of communicative aspects. Mr. Marsh faintly praises only Mr. Cunningham's communication theory, and even this praise has nothing to do with what Mr. Cunningham tells us of literary communication, but with his conception of poetry as a "fine art."

But communication theories do not develop in the vacuum of the theoretical mind. They derive from the countless experiences of persons to whom literature has conveyed or transmitted something—ideas, meanings, perceptions, feelings, etc. Of course we cannot actually believe that any competent critic—certainly not Aristotle defining the function of tragedy in terms of its effects on an audience—denies literature a communicative aspect. I do not really doubt Mr. Marsh's awareness of it. He has simply succumbed, at least temporarily, to the competitor's temptation. Specifically disputing only one of a few aspects of a given theory, he is tempted into giving the appearance of discrediting a whole theory by the simple expedient of finding nothing whatever valuable in it.

Unfortunately, this approach rapidly turns against its user and may even endanger the acceptance of his own valuable insights. Once the strategy, how-

[6] Marsh, p. 492.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 491.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 492.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 493.

ever unconscious, is recognized, it in no way strengthens the specific argument and at the same time it leaves one open to the charge that he is simply unaware of aspects which the "mistaken" theory has actually explained.

## III

2. *Theories may differ in explaining a relation of one literary aspect to another.*

One may not only ignore the possible value of speculations concerned with interests different from one's own. Also, in a desire to prove his favored theory superior to all others, the critic may fail to observe in different approaches even basic similarities to his own position. One of his most striking failures of this sort occurs when he concerns himself with the multiplicity of ways in which various theorists relate aspects of literature to one another.

There is, as a matter of fact, a competitive element in presenting the various relations between aspects in different speculations. Sometimes, for example, pleasure is considered to be the aim of literature, and truth is thought to be a by-product; again, truth is considered to be the aim of literature, and pleasure is thought to be a by-product. Analyses of this sort compete with one another. In this case, for example, there is a real dispute concerning the necessary function of literature.

The pluralist will be alert to the possibilities of such differences between theories while being also alert to the possibility of their similarities in still other respects. Such an approach is immensely advantageous to the pluralist, even as a competitor. Quite capable of observing the real differences between his favored theory and all others, he can still capitalize on those aspects of other theories which substantiate his own opinions. Also, no little thing in a peculiarly divisive age of criticism, he can feel some pleasure in having contributed to public understanding of areas of real agreement.

We may notice, in Mr. Marsh's attack on Kenneth Burke, a very good example, I think, of an argument which might be considerably improved by a pluralist approach.

Mr. Marsh particularly disapproves of Mr. Burke's "extrinsic" approach to literature. Saying that Mr. Burke's "main interest has always been extrinsic," Mr. Marsh seems almost to suggest that Mr. Burke does not deal with literature at all. Having put "rhetoric" and "poetic" at separate poles, Mr. Marsh maintains that "Burke is a rhetorician, but he knows it." Mr. Marsh concludes that "there is some doubt" that Mr. Burke will ever be able to "get at the poem as a poem."[10]

Mr. Marsh is quite correct, I think, in observing that Mr. Burke's is an "extrinsic" critical approach. We may applaud this insight at the same time that we must regret the treatment of Mr. Burke as a simply "wrong" competitor in the field of theory. This procedure is unnecessarily expensive. The critic deprives dramatic theory of the support which Mr. Burke so handsomely offers and denies to the latter something of his real achievement.

The pluralist, while keeping a keen eye for the differences between Mr. Marsh's and Mr. Burke's theories, will not be forced into suffering such losses of insight.

In the first place, by being attentive to similarities in difference, the pluralist will notice that Mr. Marsh, eager to develop a dramatic "Aristotelian" theory of the lyric, can greatly bulwark his opinions by a reliance on Mr. Burke. No modern theorist has exceeded Mr.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 491.

Burke in a stress on the dramatic nature of literature or its consideration as "action."

Happily, Mr. Burke himself has approached the matter "pluralistically." He has very carefully attempted to explain his own understanding, at least, of the rather complicated relations which exist between his own critical approach and that of the "Neo-Aristotelians." At times, he finds their approaches very similar to his. In commenting on a representative critical analysis by Elder Olson, Mr. Burke suggests that Mr. Olson's "discussion of the poem itself is thoroughly dramatistic."[11] Later he hints that in certain respects Olson, Crane, and Norman MacLean might as well "ply their trade under the trade-name of 'dramatism' rather than 'Aristotle.' "[12]

I personally believe that Mr. Burke is correct in assuming a close identity at important points between his own critical approach and that of the Chicago School. However, even if one finds less similarity, it would be a pity to ignore altogether the substantial aid which Mr. Burke offers to any person seeking to forge a dramatic theory of lyric poetry.

Beyond finding support for a dramatic emphasis in Mr. Burke's work, the pluralist also will be able to treat even the extrinsic emphasis of that work with more precision than a competitive analysis is likely to manage. The pluralist, by being alert to differences in similarity, will be quick to notice the very real differences between Mr. Burke's approach and that of many another extrinsic emphasis.

It is quite true that some extrinsic approaches do not "get at the poem as a poem." Discovering where Byron went that Saturday night quite possibly may fail to provide information which helps us to read Byron's Sunday morning sonnet. But Mr. Burke's is of course a particular kind of extrinsic approach, and it leads him very quickly into the poem. Again it is worth noting Mr. Burke's own understanding of his relations at this point to the Neo-Aristotelians. He suggests that "when Mr. Crane says that the poem is to be considered 'as a product of purposive activity on the part of its author,' we would agree with him, only more intensely than he would want us to." Mr. Burke then specifically disclaims any inability to treat the poem intrinsically: "The treatment of the poem as an act would not, by any means, require us to slight the nature of the poem as object. For a poem is a *constitutive* act—and after the act of its composition by a poet who had acted in a particular temporal scene, it survives as an objective structure, capable of being examined in itself, in temporal scenes quite different from the scene of its composition, and by agents quite different from the agent who originally enacted it. The enactment thus remaining as a constitution, we can inquire into the principles by which this constitution is organized."[13]

I personally find that Mr. Burke's critical practice frequently conforms to the possibilities for intrinsic analysis which he claims for his approach. In his emphasis on the poem as, roughly, the expression of a poet's "burdens"—physical and psychological[14]—Mr. Burke's approach is in some respects like that of certain psychological critics. But these critics tend to view the work of the poet as a kind of comment of no more intrin-

[11] Kenneth Burke, "The Problem of the Intrinsic (as reflected in the Neo-Aristotelian School)," *A Grammar of Motives* (New York, 1945), p. 479.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 481-482.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 482.

[14] See for example Kenneth Burke, *Philosophy of Literary Form* (Louisiana State University Press, 1941), pp. 17-18.

sic interest than the material collected in case-studies of neurotic patients.[15] Mr. Burke is very careful to distinguish his own interest, in theory and ordinarily in practice, from that of critics like these. Thus he finds a poem by Keats, for example, to be intrinsically interesting, intrinsically valuable.[16]

The pluralist, then, discovers two important respects in which the theories of Mr. Burke and the Neo-Aristotelians mutually reinforce one another. Of course no one could deny the student his right to prefer the complete Neo-Aristotelian theory to Mr. Burke's theory. But the student who is eager to emphasize the dramatic nature of lyric poetry and the value of intrinsic criticism can nevertheless gain substantial support of these points from Mr. Burke.

The pluralist, alert to such agreements, also will keep a keen eye for the real differences between theorists. He will not be able to criticize Mr. Burke for not having discovered intrinsic aspects of poetry, or even for not having gotten at the poem "as a poem." An objective reading of Mr. Burke simply will not permit of such an interpretation. But the pluralist will be able to discover that Mr. Burke differs from many critics in his understanding of just what is *in* a poem. If he is correct, we dare not have a too-restricted view of what it means to refer to "the poem as poem," and we will probably have to see any given poem as, somehow intrinsically, a projection of certain cultural and biographical factors.

For example, in analyzing Keats's poem, Mr. Burke writes: "Our primary concern is to follow the transformations of the poem itself. But to understand its full nature as a symbolic act, we should use whatever knowledge is available. In the case of Keats, not only do we know the place of this poem in his work and its time, but also we have material to guide our speculations as regards correlations between poem and poet." Mr. Burke then suggests that this attempt to expand our conception of what is *in* a poem may "interfere with the symmetry of criticism as a game" which is "best to watch, I guess, when one confines himself to the single unit." Nevertheless, according to Mr. Burke, "linguistic analysis has opened up new possibilities in the correlating of producer and product."[17]

I suspect that this suggests the chief issue between Mr. Burke and those critics whose analysis of literature is more "purely" intrinsic. The issue is not whether Mr. Burke knows that the poem is there. He does know it, just as the best "intrinsic" critics, for their part, know that somebody, with his burdens, wrote it. The issue is one of the proper relation of work to its time and author, and there are quite legitimate ways in which Mr. Burke can be challenged in his understanding of that relation.

But, even though I personally believe that Mr. Burke's studies tell us *more* about the poet's imagination than they tell us about his poems, his studies also tell us a very great deal—more than we get from many other, more obviously "intrinsic," studies—about poems. Furthermore, what he finds is greatly conditioned by his stress on dramatic aspects of literature; the theorist who of-

[15] See for example Stanley Edgar Hyman's discussion of the "obvious limitations of traditional Freudian literary analysis," *The Armed Vision* (New York, 1948), p. 166. "A criticism that can only say, however ingeniously, that this work is the result of the author's repressed Oedipal desires, and that everybody has repressed Oedipal desires, turns out not to be saying very much" (about intrinsic aspects of the piece).

[16] Burke, "Symbolic Action in a Poem by Keats," *A Grammar of Motives*, pp. 447-463; esp., pp. 462-463.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 451.

fers a view of poetry's "dramatic form" has probably less reason than anyone else to disregard Mr. Burke's perceptions. Nor is there any need to disregard them. If we are pluralistically alert to the fact that "the diverse may be contradictory or not," we will discover both areas of substantial agreement and areas of real difference.

## IV

*3. Theories may be classified in many ways, according to various kinds of similarities and difference.*

In assessing certain features of Kenneth Burke's writings, we have already noticed that theories are not simply like, or simply different from, one another. Their agreements and disagreements often exist in very complicated relations. Similar theories may differ substantially at a crucial point; different theories may treat similarly a certain aspect.

Obviously the student of these speculations should be alert to the rapid shifting of theoretical alignments with respect to a given aspect or issue. He will realize that what C. Day Lewis said of poets is also often true of literary theorists: ". . . the players are constantly fraternizing" and "exchanging jerseys."[18] Only with this realization is the student likely to understand fully the implications of the various theories, including those which he prefers.

There is, for example, the famous modern quarrel between the "Chicago school" of Neo-Aristotelians and the "new" critics. No one has taken greater pains to emphasize the possible differences between these groups than R. S. Crane. Yet Mr. Crane wisely elaborates a long list of issues on which the groups are agreed, and in terms of which they join forces against other theorists. Crane agrees with them, for example, in their consideration of poetry as "poetry and not another thing," in their stress on "particularized studies of texts," in their "desire to rescue poetic from the dictatorship of factual science," etc.[19]

However, the relations between the Chicago school and the "new" critics are even more complicated, I think, than Mr. Crane suggests. For example, in their emphasis on the "dramatic" nature of poetry, the theories of the modern Aristotelians and of Burke (as well as of "new" critics Brooks and Blackmur) are similar to one another, and all differ in this respect from the theories of poetry as knowledge held by "new" critics Ransom and Tate.

As we have seen in discussing Mr. Burke's relationship to the Neo-Aristotelians, there are of course meaningful differences between "dramatic" theories. Cleanth Brooks, for example, suggests that "the structure of a poem resembles that of a play. . . . The dynamic nature of drama, in short, allows us to regard it as *an action* rather than as a formula for action. For this reason, therefore, perhaps the most helpful analogy by which to suggest the structure of poetry is that of the drama, and for many readers at least, the least confusing way in which to approach a poem is to think of it as a drama."[20] Elder Olson's view differs at least in degree. Aristotle's poetic deals, he says, with that poetry which "imitates a *system* of actions." "Most of what we call lyric poetry" can be seen as "a single character acting in a single closed situation." This poetry is to be distinguished from a tragedy in that both are "whole and complete ac-

[18] C. Day Lewis, *The Poetic Image* (New York, 1947), p. 30.

[19] R. S. Crane, "The Critical Monism of Cleanth Brooks," *Critics and Criticism*, p. 83.

[20] Cleanth Brooks, *The Well Wrought Urn* (New York, 1947), pp. 186-187.

tions," so that a lyric "differs from a speech in a play."[21]

Probably the similarities of these views are more striking than their differences. In any event, they are both "dramatic" in the sense that they would take poetry out of competition with "discourse." Tate and Ransom on the other hand (though they certainly do not fail to recognize dramatic elements in lyric poetry[22]) chiefly emphasize poetry as a *superior* form of discourse: "Literature is the complete knowledge of man's experience"[23] or "in the poem, we get knowledge of a whole object."[24]

A failure to notice this particular "dramatic" emphasis of disparate theories is, I think, especially to be regretted by the student of oral interpretation. Many of the most important implications which Mr. Marsh, for example, finds in Aristotle for the oral interpreter receive solid support from the "dramatic" emphasis of modern theories.

These moderns in their stress on the difference between literature and scientific, or philosophic, or "abstract" discourse imply that "think-the-thought" theories of oral reading are necessarily oversimplified. They imply what Mr. Marsh understands to be the Aristotelian implication: that the oral interpreter's proper approach to a lyric poem, for example, is like that of an actor to a play.[25]

Not only do these theories help direct the interpreter's relationship to literature; they imply, I think, the considerable value of that relationship. Mr. Marsh writes that "the Aristotelian approach in no way invalidates or discredits the current opinion that oral interpretation may provide a useful means of studying literature."[26] I am glad that Mr. Marsh has risked this opinion, for there are still only a relatively few professional literary people who have much faith in oral interpretation as a valid means of literary study. But we might wish that he would more readily avail himself of the support so easily found in modern literary speculation. For the current opinion that oral interpretation has an integral part in literary education has not materialized from thin air, but from careful attention to the implications of the very theories which Mr. Marsh seems to dismiss.

The oral interpreter should, I think, capitalize on these dramatic dimensions of literary theories, however different from his own they may otherwise be. In terms of their common dramatic emphasis, work in oral interpretation becomes a fundamentally important approach to literary study. What is dramatic deserves to be dramatized, and if a lyric poem is a little drama, the oral interpreter does well to give it a little production.

Though the theories behind this view may well have different values and consistency, it is surely not necessary for the oral interpreter to dismiss all but what he thinks is the most valuable theory. I do not personally think that modern Aristotelian interpretation is the best of dramatic theories, but even if you agree with me, we must surely be glad to receive what aid it offers. We are wise to accept the gift of various sorts and orders of insight that are afforded by the various kinds of dramatic theories.

V

*4. Theories sometimes explain different aspects of literature in the same terminology.*

The pluralist should have no trouble

[21] Olson, *Critics and Criticism*, p. 560.
[22] See for example Allen Tate, *On the Limits of Poetry* (New York, 1948), p. 364.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 48.
[25] Marsh, p. 492.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 498.

in taking pleasure in more than one order of insight. Consequently, he will understand that terms may be used in more than one way to reveal different phenomena.

This understanding, I think, should soften considerably Mr. Marsh's objection to an application I once made of the who-what-how-where-when-why series of questions to a lyric poem.[27] Mr. Marsh is under the impression that I have used Mr. Burke's terminology, but that I have distorted it in a manner which Mr. Burke would not approve.[28]

This is not, I think, a proper interpretation of the matter. Rather, I think the truth is that Mr. Burke and I have used the same set of terms, original with neither of us, to different purposes.

It is only fair to note that Mr. Marsh's different understanding may not, in this case, be the fault of his competitive approach to theory. Language is of course slippery, and my own introduction of the terms may have been misleading. However, I think that a pluralistic regard for questions of formulation will rather rapidly clear up any confusion my article may have caused on this point.

In that article I mentioned that Kenneth Burke had used these terms successfully for a quite complicated purpose. I also mentioned that newspaper reporters use these questions successfully for a quite uncomplicated purpose.[29] My own purpose in mentioning both the reporter and Mr. Burke was that each of them approaches (different) aspects of "life" or "action" or "experience" by (different) uses of the who-what questions. Since I think of many poems, including many lyric poems, as representations of "life" or "action" or "experience," it struck me that the same questions might also help us to discover important aspects of a poem.

Consequently I suggested that these questions may provide some help in the relatively uncomplicated task of elucidating poems. To my knowledge, Mr. Burke himself has never analyzed an entire poem in that fashion, though I would not seek to deny similarities. For example, Mr. Burke's suggestion of a distinction between the agent and scenes of the creative act and the agent and scenes of the created object, quite possibly prepares for this kind of analysis.

With this background in mind, I think it is clear that these who-what terms, or questions, are no more "Mr. Burke's" of course than they are mine or those of my high school Journalism teacher who first pointed them out to me. They belong to anyone who can find a legitimate use for them, and in the pluralist's thinking, the more uses, the better.

Much of the terminology of criticism is susceptible of various kinds of manipulation and application. But this is often forgotten. Admirable as is Mr. Burke's achievement, he must sometimes become uneasy over having some students attribute to him a perfect triumph over the critical dictionary. For example, Stanley Hyman once suggested that Yvor Winters' attempt to use some of Kenneth Burke's terminology was "foredoomed"—doomed, we are led to believe, simply because Mr. Winters wished to use the same terminology to *evaluate* a state of affairs that Mr. Burke had been satisfied primarily to describe.[30] But when we read Mr. Burke[31] and Mr.

[27] Don Geiger, "A 'Dramatic' Approach to Interpretative Analysis," *QJS*, XXXVIII (April 1952), 189-194.
[28] Marsh, p. 491.
[29] Geiger, p. 189.
[30] Hyman, p. 372.
[31] Kenneth Burke, "Lexicon Rhetoricae," *Critiques and Essays in Criticism*, ed. Robert Wooster Stallman (New York, 1949), pp. 231-236.

Winters[32]—whether we like both, one, or neither—we find little to trouble us in their different uses of the same terms. The different meanings carried by the same terminology are easily understood in these writers.

Our task, surely, is to make the mental adjustments necessary to understand several uses of the same terminology. We should, I think, encourage different uses when they help us, slightly or extensively as the case may be, to discover a multitude of ways of analyzing, understanding, and evaluating literature.

## VI

*5. Theories often describe the same aspects of literature in different terminology.*

One of the great dangers in setting one theory apart from another in total competition is that we may be led into denying meaningful similarity between theories which are formulated in different terms.

Mr. Marsh, for example, finds a difference between Aristotelian theory and communication theory in the attention they give to the whole poem. With respect to the most thorough communication theory, this is, I believe, an erroneous interpretation which derives ultimately from a confused handling of terminology.

But let us observe Mr. Marsh's approach to the matter.

Mr. Marsh wants a theory which implies that the oral interpreter's task is "to re-create the literary object, the poem."[33] He is opposed to those theories which imply that the interpreter's task is "communication of the author's meaning"[34] because "re-creating the poem is not equivalent to communicating the total meaning."[35]

However, when Mr. Marsh suggests that "re-creating the poem" and "communicating the total meaning" are not equal things, his words are subject to an important proviso: ". . . unless to begin with total meaning is construed as essentially different from discourse."[36] But of course the best speculations which account for communicative aspects of literature begin with just that assumption: that total meaning in literature is something different from discourse.

We may note, for example, I. A. Richards' famous modern development of a theory of literature as communication. According to this theory (and without considering it, an assessment of communication theory is hardly possible, both because of its own excellence and because of its important influence on much modern theory), "The all-important fact for the study of literature—or any other mode of communication—is that there are several kinds of meaning . . . the Total Meaning we are engaged with is, almost always, a blend, a combination of several contributory meanings of different types."[37]

Beyond this, Richards seems to assume the indivisibility of the *whole* poem and the meaning which the poem communicates. Richards would have it, roughly, that a poem communicates a certain sort of "Total Meaning" (of feeling, tone, sense, and intention) which is an "experience." He keeps, of course, to an emphasis on literature's communicative aspects: "An experience has to be formed, no doubt, before it is communi-

[32] Yvor Winters, *In Defense of Reason* (New York, 1947), pp. 30-34; 57-64. At one point, Winters even makes a specific declaration: "Kenneth Burke has named and described this method without evaluating it." (p. 30).

[33] Marsh, p. 492.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 491.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 492.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 492.

[37] I. A. Richards, *Practical Criticism* (New York, 1949), p. 180.

cated, but it takes the form it does largely because it may have to be communicated."[38]

Even a critic like Cleanth Brooks, whose approach is in many respects quite different from that of Richards, recognizes what his communication theory has accomplished in stressing the importance of the whole poem. For example, in a passage in which Mr. Brooks asks for a theory acknowledging the poet as one who "explores, consolidates, and 'forms' the total experience that is the poem," he says that the poet is "more truthfully described as a *poietes* or maker, not as an expositor or communicator." But, happily, this conviction does not force Mr. Brooks into an inability to understand the possibilities of communication theory. "Pluralistically" alive to the similarities which may reside in different formulations, he suggests that "It is doubtless possible to elaborate a theory of communication which will adequately cover these points. I believe that I. A. Richards, if I understand him correctly, has attempted to qualify his theory in precisely this way. At any rate, the net effect of his criticism has been to emphasize the need of a more careful reading of poetry and to regard the poem as an organic thing."[39]

Mr. Brooks himself has explicitly indicated the importance of the whole poem to the determination of its meaning. Having discussed the meanings of certain poems, Mr. Brooks concludes: "But, in attempting to reconcile the 'meanings' of the two poems, one should not tempt the reader to substitute another abstract proposition for the 'meaning.' What is important is that, in the case of either poem, any statement which we attempt to abstract from the whole context as the 'meaning' of the poem is seen to be qualified and modified by the context of the poem taken as a whole."[40]

Interestingly enough, perhaps the single most striking assumption of modern literary theory is that we do not know the "total meaning" of a poem apart from our understanding of the poem-as-a-whole. Mr. Mark Schorer summarizes the achievement of an age of criticism when he writes that "Modern criticism, through its exacting scrutiny of literary texts, has demonstrated with finality that in art beauty and truth are indivisible and one"; and Mr. Schorer goes on to say that this implies that "form" and "content" are one.[41]

We can only conclude, from the impressive amount of evidence of which I have quoted a small part, that many moderns who account for communicative aspects are quite insistent on the importance of the literary work as a whole, and on the failure to preserve its wholeness when attempts are made to separate it into themes or "basic" ideas.

Obviously, Mr. Marsh's real difficulty with the most inclusive communication theory must lie elsewhere. I think that we are given a strong hint of the nature of this difficulty in Mr. Marsh's suggestion that when someone begins by construing "total meaning" as something different from discourse, "there is no need for the term *meaning* at all."[42] Apparently this is Mr. Marsh's real dissatisfaction with communication theory: not that it cannot pay attention to the whole literary object, but that it does so in what is to him an unpleasant language.

I think it is clear that we should seek a more subtle analysis which does not

[38] Richards, *Principles of Literary Criticism*, p. 25.
[39] Brooks, pp. 69-70.
[40] *Ibid.*, pp. 174-175.
[41] Mark Schorer, "Technique as Discovery," *Essays in Modern Literary Criticism*, ed. Ray B. West, Jr. (New York, 1952), pp. 189-190.
[42] Marsh, p. 492.

ignore or exploit but is instead sharply alert to the ambiguous possibilities of terms. Such alertness, fundamental to a pluralistic approach, will often discover wide areas of agreement between apparently different theories.

We have just discussed one such agreement in analyzing the stress placed on the whole literary work by certain "communication" theories as well as by certain "dramatic" theories. Perhaps it is not so astonishing that similarities between these theories, moving in such different directions, are not easily detected. However, it is more surprising to notice that an overly competitive approach to a study of theory often makes it difficult to notice the close relations between speculations which are in many ways similar to one another.

For example, I believe that there is a closer correspondence between Mr. Marsh's views and my own than he suggests. A pluralistic isolation of the "differences of formulation from the differences of truths and falsities" should enable us to discover that mutually helpful similarity.

If I am correct, in two recent articles I outlined a view of literature and of the oral interpreter's task which is similar in important respects to Mr. Marsh's own opinions.

Mr. Marsh suggests that I have in one of these essays[43] supported a view of literature as a "complex of attitudes"; and, given certain qualifications, this is quite true. However, in citing the second essay, he neglects to mention that literature is therein considered as a "representation of selected experience."[44]

Mr. Marsh is quite right to assume that, given the qualifications of both essays, there is nothing incompatible in these views. I observed in the essay whose formulation Mr. Marsh briefly paraphrases that attitudes are "taken *toward* something."[45] In the second essay this observation is more fully developed: "experience" is considered, broadly, as situation-attitude relationships, and a piece of literature is seen as a representation of experience—that is, of certain selected situation-attitude relationships.

I do not regret that Mr. Marsh chose to cite the formula of only one of these essays, since one speculation grows out of the other. Nevertheless, it is disturbing to notice that his particular choice makes it more difficult to recognize certain basic similarities in our positions.

Mr. Marsh wants us to think of a lyric poem as the "imitation of an action." He then tells us that "imitation" in his essay is roughly equivalent to "portrayal" or "representation."[46] Now "representation of action" certainly *sounds* as if it were different from a complex of attitudes; however it does not sound so different from "representation of experience" and only a highly competitive reading would, I believe, ignore the similar phrase.

The problem of maintaining a polar difference between these positions becomes even more acute as one investigates them more closely. Broadly considering "experience" as situation-attitude relationships, I had more precisely defined it as "the feelings, responses, and evaluations which are generated by and encompass various situations."[47] My specific example was A. E. Housman's lyric poem, "Loveliest of Trees," which was seen as the depiction of the awareness of the beauty of cherry trees in the woods at springtime on the part of a

[43] Geiger, "Oral Interpretation and the 'New Criticism,'" *QJS* XXXVI (December 1950), 508-513.

[44] Geiger, "A 'Dramatic' Approach to Interpretative Analysis," p. 189.

[45] Geiger, "Oral Interpretation and the 'New Criticism,'" p. 512.

[46] Marsh, p. 492.

[47] Geiger, "A 'Dramatic' Approach to Interpretative Analysis," p. 189.

young man (not the mature poet, Housman) who is aware of the short time in life which he has to look at beautiful things.[48]

Mr. Marsh does not define "action" in an explicit fashion but his suggestion of how we are to read Wordsworth's "The Solitary Reaper" is revealing. Mr. Marsh says that we are to think of it as "the poet's portrayal of an act of troubled searching on the part of a human being who is deeply sensitive to natural, melancholy, and humble things, but who is not exceedingly analytical or patient, for the 'meaning' of a song," etc.[49]

I can only conclude that Mr. Marsh understands the "action" of a poem to be something close to what I (and of course many another person) mean by "selected experience." Each formula reveals a poem as the formed experience of its speaker, or character.

Once understood, this should somewhat relieve Mr. Marsh's concern that my essays imply the reduction of "the oral reading of poetry to a kind of think-the-thought adjustment to a complex of attitudes that is supposed to be the poem."[50] Given the most loosely "common sense" and least qualified definition possible of "attitude," it is still something which you surely cannot express simply by "thinking" it. Rather obviously, I think, the formed attitudes of a poem become the oral interpreter's own only when he has had a total organic, empathic response to the poem.[51]

But Mr. Marsh says that this is what Aristotle's view implies.[52] Only an overly competitive interpretation would, I think, insist that since I am not Aristotle I cannot possibly think so too. In suggesting that, Mr. Marsh leaves us with the needless impression that his own opinions will be weakened by the discovery of a similar position. But surely neither Aristotle's theory nor Mr. Marsh's understanding of it is so frail that it cannot bear comparison.

Certainly a happier approach would indicate the long continuity of dramatic theories, from ancient to modern times. Nor is this to forsake argument where argument is legitimately possible. There are many possibilities for legitimate distinctions between theories of literature as "imitation of an action" and as a "representation of selected experience," for example. To discuss the differences in any detail is the subject for another essay. But, briefly, I prefer "representation of selected experience" to the "imitation of an action," in part because it reduces the field of ambiguity. Richard McKeon argues at length that the ancients themselves were clear and subtle enough in their use of "imitation,"[53] but the word comes to us freighted with centuries of varied interpretations and with unfortunate *copyist* overtones. Like Mr. Marsh, the modern Aristotelian always begins by saying that "imitation" of course means something else. Also I find unsatisfying a theory which leads into the semantic obscurity of asking interpreters to "re-create a poem." Literally, this could only be done if the oral reader silently held up a large copy of the poem for his audience to read. One must instead re-create the "experience" or the "gesture" or the "attitudes" which the poem, as it is written in all of its details, creates.

These are merely examples. I mention them only to suggest that the pluralist approach to theory is not sim-

[48] *Ibid.*, pp. 189-191.
[49] Marsh, p. 492.
[50] *Ibid.*, p. 491.
[51] See Don Geiger, "Notes for a Theory of Literature," *Western Speech*, XV (October 1951), 18.
[52] Marsh, p. 492.
[53] Richard McKeon, "Literary Criticism and the Concept of Imitation in Antiquity," *Critics and Criticism*, pp. 147-175.

ply the nervous reflex of a basically compromising disposition. The pluralist is quite able to argue; his advantage is that he is not likely to confuse us in our understanding of real differences between theories by the assumption of differences which do not in fact exist.

## VII

An insistence on the competitive features of literary theories almost always leads to such confusion. However adept the competitively oriented critic is at understanding his favored theory, he appears to understand hardly any other. At a speculative level he repeats the error of unfortunate Ion, who understood Homer and only Homer. But such a critic suffers his divine limitations with less grace than Plato's inspired rhapsode. For one thing he cannot help leaving both his readers and himself in a muddle. Worse, since he has failed to recognize the areas of similarity which exist between his own and other theories, we fear that he probably has no firm grasp on the areas of difference.

The pluralist attitude implies an understanding of these differences as well as a respect for areas of agreement. The pluralist will, in short, study literary theories as in fact limited struggles, sometimes mutually supporting one another and sometimes opposing one another, and thus will gain mastery over the vastly complicated and valuable phenomena of literature and literary experience.

## THE ORATORY OF PATRICK HENRY

It is a little remarkable that the most eloquent orator to whom this country has yet given birth, should have been almost an uneducated and self-taught man. "The forest-born Demosthenes," Patrick Henry, comes more fully up to the standard of the great orators of antiquity than any other name, perhaps, recorded in our annals. True, he arose amidst the strife of great elements, yet those elements seem to have roused but one master-spirit capable of wielding the thunders and directing the lightnings of forensick eloquence. There were, in those "times that tried men's souls," minds more capacious, and of equal moral grandeur, but the powers of persuasion seem to have been pre-eminently the gift of Patrick Henry. Setting aside the sublime, the wonderful, in eloquence, there are perhaps few orators of the present day who can fairly be adduced as masters of the tender and pathetick—with power to

> "Tune their lips to that soft rhetorick
> Which steals upon the ear, and melts to pity
> The heart of the stern judge."

*New-York Mirror,* XIV (November 26, 1836), 175.

# THE RELATIVE INTELLIGIBILITY OF LANGUAGE GROUPS

John W. Black and G. C. Tolhurst

## I

A SPEAKER'S relative word-intelligibility score in a controlled testing circumstance has been found to depend upon both his skill in pronouncing the test items and his listeners' skill in identifying the items. The latter, in turn, is known to be particularly influenced by the listeners' familiarity with the words that they hear and are called upon to identify from an unspecified vocabulary.[1] In the multiple-choice intelligibility test, however, the importance of the listeners' familiarity with the vocabulary of the test is minimized in that the answer sheet enumerates the four possible responses for each item.[2]

In oral communication, if a speaker has a dialect—either foreign or regional—the listener commonly attributes his misunderstandings to that dialect. The validity of attributing misunderstandings to dialect was opened to some question by Mason's summary of the intelligibility scores of approximately 2,000 listeners and speakers, military personnel of World War II.[3] These speakers and listeners were considered as representing the dialects of the respective service commands from which each person was inducted into service, the nine service commands being viewed as dialect regions. Inductees from one particular command were least intelligible, both to their fellows and to listeners from other commands. Similarly, the personnel from another of the commands were most intelligible to all groups. Possibly these circumstances reflected dialectal speech. If so, one of the dialects was presumably characterized by precisely articulated, readily distinguished speech signals, in short, clarity of utterance; the other, by lack of such clear articulation.

Another common opinion among listeners is that a platform speaker who is difficult to understand at the outset of a speech becomes more intelligible as he progresses with his speech. If we assume that the noise level in the room does not decrease during this apparent change, the question arises, does the speaker alter his utterance or does the listener adapt to the dialect of the speaker? Two preliminary investigations of this set of alternatives have proved inconclusive.[4]

*John W. Black (Ph.D., Iowa, 1935) is a Professor of Speech at The Ohio State University at Columbus. Gilbert C. Tolhurst (Ph.D., Iowa, 1948) is a Research Associate with The Ohio State University Research Foundation in residence at the U. S. Naval School of Aviation Medicine, Pensacola, Florida.*

[1] J. W. Black, "Accompaniments of Word Intelligibility," *JSHD*, XVII (1952), 409-418.

[2] J. W. Black, "Multiple-Choice Intelligibility Tests," *Joint Project Report No. 17*, Joint Project, The Ohio State University Research Foundation and United States Naval School of Aviation Medicine (Pensacola, 1953), The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery Project NM 001 064.01.17.

[3] H. M. Mason, "Understandability of Speech in Noise as Affected by Region or Origin of Speaker and Listener," *SM*, XIII (1946), 54-58.

[4] J. B. Chaiklin, "An Experimental Investigation of Native American Listeners' Relative Adaptation in Understanding Speakers with Foreign Dialect," Unpubl. thesis (Ohio State Univ., 1953); L. Hauptmann, "A Study of the Effects of Listener Adaptation on the Change in the Intelligibility of International Students Speaking English." Unpubl. thesis (Ohio State Univ., 1952).

The foregoing considerations led to an experimental approach to test two specific conditions: the relative intelligibility of English dialect as spoken by different language groups, and the effect upon intelligibility of the listeners' familiarity with a dialect. These conditions were tested only within the framework of a test that was conducted in English.

## II

Twelve French and twelve British natives who were in military pilot training programs in the United States served along with twenty-four American students as experimental subjects. The French speakers were sufficiently proficient in English to converse in that language and to understand directions easily. Both French and British subjects participated in three principal experimental tasks.

1. Each member of the French and of the British experimental groups read and recorded a word list from both Forms A and B of the multiple-choice intelligibility tests, a different list being used for each member of a group.[5] The reading occurred in a sound-treated studio, in quiet, and was recorded through a high-fidelity magnetic tape recording system.

[5] C. H. Haagen, "Intelligibility Measurement: Twenty-four Word Multiple-Choice Tests," *OSRD Report No. 5567*, Psychological Corp. (New York, Sept. 1945).

Four multiple-choice intelligibility tests are available, designated Forms A, B, C, and D. Each is comprised of 24-27 words that are read as three-word groups, e.g. "number one food rod book." The listener's answer sheet shows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| brood | rod | foot |
| showed | run | book |
| flue | red | took |
| food | nod | boat |

The listener crosses out the three words that he believes he hears, one in each column.

The error words, *brood, showed,* and *flue,* were selected because they were the most frequent incorrect responses when *food* was spoken as a test item in a write-down intelligibility test, etc.

2. Each speaker later read and recorded five minutes of prose from articles of current interest in a popular magazine.

3. Subsequently, the speakers served as listeners and responded to twenty-four of the recorded word lists, twelve spoken by the French speakers and twelve by the British. The listeners heard the recordings through military headsets consisting of PDR-3 earphones. The noise level in the listening room was 114 db. The noise was white or thermal. The signal at the listener's ear exceeded the noise level under the earphone by 3-4 db.

The American experimental subjects heard all of the recordings that had been made by the British and French speakers. This listening involved four consecutive tasks.

1. The American listeners in groups of twelve heard and responded to one of the French or British recordings of either Form A or B of the intelligibility test.

2. Next, the group heard the five-minute prose passages that had been recorded by the twelve speakers who recorded the intelligibility test. During the sixty-minute period of "voice familiarization" the listeners had reproductions of the recorded paragraphs and could read the material concurrently with hearing it. This "familiarization" occurred in quiet, over the headset system.

3. The panel of listeners then heard the alternate set of intelligibility tests previously recorded by the same British or French speakers. Thus, if the panel had heard Form A by a given speaker, it now heard Form B by the same speaker.

4. In the final portion of the experiment the American listeners and the French and British subjects as well per-

formed a fourth task as part of a separate comparison. The three groups, French, British, and American, responded to Form C of the multiple-choice intelligibility tests. This was presented from recordings that had been made by three American speakers who were not otherwise a part of the study.

## III

The principal results of the study are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. The mean reception scores enumerated in Table 1 show that the French and British listeners did not receive statistically different scores when hearing the French speakers, 53.5 and 52.3% respectively. The scores of both of the above groups of listeners were higher to a statistically significant degree when they heard British speakers, 61.5 and 76.8% for the French and British listeners respectively. In this comparison the scores of the British listeners were significantly higher than the scores of the French listeners. These results suggest that when French speakers read a test in a foreign language, the dialect of the speakers inflicted an equal penalty upon the British listeners who were of the language group of the test and the French listeners who were of another language. However, when the test comprised of English words was read by British speakers and heard by listeners of the two language groups, British and French, significantly higher scores were obtained than when the French recordings were heard. Moreover, the French listeners accorded higher scores to the British speakers than they did to the French speakers. It may be noteworthy that the French listeners had received their instruction in the English language preponderantly from British teachers.

Table 1

RELATIVE MEAN INTELLIGIBILITY SCORES OF FRENCH AND BRITISH SPEAKERS AS HEARD BY FRENCH AND BRITISH LISTENERS. N per Group, 12.

| Listeners | Speakers | |
|---|---|---|
| | French | British |
| French | 53.5±11.1 | 61.5±10.8 |
| British | 52.3± 8.0 | 76.8± 7.9 |

TABLE 2

RELATIVE INTELLIGIBILITY OF FRENCH AND BRITISH SPEAKERS AS HEARD BY AMERICAN LISTENERS WITH AND WITHOUT FAMILIARIZATION IN THE DIALECTS.

| | French | British |
|---|---|---|
| Without voice familiarization | 50.7±10.23 | 63.4±12.57 |
| With voice familiarization | 58.4± 7.97 | 71.2± 9.51 |

The scores of American listeners (50.7%) who heard the French speakers were not significantly different from the scores of the French (53.5%) and British listeners (52.3%). However, as indicated in Table 2, after the Americans listened to the prose recordings of the French speakers for sixty minutes, the speech reception scores were significantly improved, 58.4 *vs.* 50.7% ($t$, less than 1%). A similar improvement in speech reception scores occurred when the American listeners were familiarized with the dialect of the British speakers, 71.2 *vs.* 63.4% ($t$, less than 1%). These results, enumerated in Table 2, are subject to the qualification that the pairs of scores were earned in a situation in which an order effect, or practice effect, was inherent. Typically, listeners earn higher scores on the second of two speech reception tests. This is found to be usually an increment of 2-3%. The present difference, however, was 8%.

In the final comparison among the three dialect groups of listeners, the French, British, and Americans heard

a recording of three American speakers reading Form C of the multiple-choice intelligibility tests (Form C is more difficult than Forms A and B; therefore, the scores of the two tests cannot be compared directly). The French, British, and American listeners' scores, obtained from hearing the Americans' recording of Form C, were 48.5, 69.5, and 77.3% respectively. Thus, these particular speakers were least intelligible to the listeners of a foreign language dialect group and most intelligible to listeners of their own national dialect. All differences were statistically significant.

## IV

The results of this study indicate that intelligibility test items in English, spoken in a French dialect, were equally unintelligible to French listeners, to whom the French speakers' dialect in English is probably a "common listening experience," and to British and American listeners, to whom the language of the test is vernacular but a French dialect "fairly uncommon."

When the test was read by two groups (British and American) who were native speakers of the language of the test (English) and was heard by both of the native language groups and by a foreign language group, the two native language listener groups obtained the higher listening scores.

Irrespective of whether the test items were read in a foreign dialect (French) or a native language dialect (British), reception scores were improved when the American listeners were familiarized with the particular dialect of the speakers for one hour. In other words, familiarity with a dialect, induced by one hour of experience, improved the listeners' reception of that dialect.[6]

When a single test (American speakers) was heard in common by listeners of a foreign dialect (French), a native language foreign dialect (British), and by listeners of the same dialect as the speakers (American), the listeners *of the same dialect* (American) obtained a higher reception score than did the other two groups. The listeners of the native language foreign dialect (British) obtained a higher score than listeners of a foreign language dialect (French).

To bring these few observations into focus, Mason found intelligibility to be related to geography within the United States. Dialect is also related to geography. Unfortunately, however, educational attainment and linguistic sophistication, matters that affect intelligibility scores, may too be related to geography. Thus, a particular regional speech may or may not be singularly understandable. Also, an apparent rapid increase in the intelligibility of a lecturer who has a "severe" dialect remains undocumented in terms of intelligibility scores. The present results, however, are somewhat reassuring to the student who would continue to quantify dialect using criterion measures of relative intelligibility. At least, gross differences in dialect are amenable to the intelligibility measure and either five minutes of familiarization with a voice or an hour of familiarization with a dialect—it could be either—improves the speech reception of listeners.

[6] The plan of the experiment permitted each listener to hear himself as a speaker. These listener scores were not used in the principal analyses; however, the difference between "hearing oneself" and "hearing others" was not statistically significant either in the instance of French or British experimental subjects.

# THE FORUM

## THE *QJS* AND *SM*: A PROBLEM IN BOUNDARIES

On December 28, 1947, at the Salt Lake City Convention of the SAA, a committee was appointed to consider not only the importance to the Association of research studies in Speech, and not only the nature and scope of the functions and responsibilities of what was then called our Editor of Research Publications, but also the distinctions that should be drawn between the content of *SM* and the *QJS*.

No doubt this committee studied the three matters assigned to it and in due course made a report to the Executive Council of the SAA. No doubt that report is available to anyone who would search our archives. But it seems never to have been transmitted to the Editor of the *QJS* in such fashion as to become for him and his successors a continuing policy in regard to the respective domains of the two oldest publications of the SAA.

The third and most recent of our publications, *The Speech Teacher*, was founded as a quarterly designed primarily for elementary and secondary school teachers of Speech. This objective, as stated in the Minutes of the Executive Council for December 28-30, 1950, clearly implies that the *QJS* and *SM* are understood to reach college and university teachers of undergraduate and graduate Speech courses, and that the *ST* will avoid these areas entirely. But it may be doubted that the line between the lower school and the higher school teacher can or should be preserved if high quality is to be maintained throughout the pages of our three journals. And even if that line can be preserved between the *ST* and the *QJS*, what then should be the nature of the line between the *QJS* and *SM*?

These problems need careful study. As the present Editor of the *QJS* sees them, they need careful study in order to avoid any unseemly competition among our three journals for the same type of manuscript. This competition arises because each of our journals appears four times a year, and if the supply of publishable manuscripts within the vague traditional boundaries of any one of our journals should fail to fill its particular need, then the Editor has no recourse but to seek manuscripts outside his own boundaries. If he succeeds, he solves his own problem, but his fellow Editors suffer as a result. If he fails, his fellow Editors may feel complacent, but his own journal suffers. And of course the SAA suffers in either case. It is to be noticed that the rise of regional Speech journals, each one a competitor for a few of the manuscripts that might otherwise be published in the three national journals, has enlarged the problem considerably. It has enlarged the problem, not only by decreasing the supply of first-rate manuscripts available to the national journals, but also by creating a situation in which standards are lowered by certain regional journals in order to guarantee immediate publication of articles that have been judged by the national journals to be acceptable only after further revisions.

Three questions deserve special consideration. 1) What is the approximate total number of first-rate publishable manuscripts available during an average

year to *SM*, the *ST*, and the *QJS*? By first-rate publishable manuscripts I mean those which are acceptable at once without revision, and those acceptable after some revision. All other manuscripts would be of doubtful value to any Editor, although some might turn out to be publishable if an author and the Editor have patience. 2) Do these first-rate manuscripts fall into categories so that the ones addressed to elementary and secondary school teachers are sufficient to support the *ST*, while the ones addressed to college and university teachers are sufficient to support the *QJS* and and *SM*? If not, should a new distinction be adopted between the *ST*, on the one hand, and the *QJS* and *SM*, on the other? 3) Of the manuscripts in the college category, which ones would seem properly to belong to the *QJS*, and which to *SM*? Should the distinction between a learned article and a learned monograph be invoked as the proper distinction between these two journals? If so, does this amount merely to the question of length? Or should the distinction between a report on research and a guide to research be invoked? If so, we know what to do with bibliographies, indexes, and so on, but are these sufficiently numerous to support four issues of the journal assigned to them? Or should the distinction be invoked between the relatively popular learned article and the relatively specialized learned article? If so, have we not fatally limited the appeal of one of our journals, and have we not fastened upon the other an unscholarly implication that might invite subsequent abuse and even damage us irreparably in the eyes of the learned world?

The present Editor of the *QJS* does not know how these questions should be answered. But he feels that they could be profitably studied. He wonders whether they might not be discussed in The Forum of the *ST* and the *QJS*, on the theory that discussion might clarify the lines of approach that should be followed in a later study. He invites your opinion.

W.S.H.

## PRESENTATION OF THE SPEECH EDUCATION VOLUME

*(Editor's note: At the joint luncheon of the SAA, NSSC, NUEA, and AFA in Chicago on December 29, 1954, Karl R. Wallace presented to the SAA the volume of studies entitled* History of Speech Education in America: Background Studies. *This volume had been in preparation since 1947 under the auspices of an Editorial Board composed of Warren Guthrie, Frederick W. Haberman, Barnard Hewitt, Karl R. Wallace, Harold Westlake, and Claude M. Wise, with Wallace serving as Editor in Chief. Completed and published last September at New York by Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., this volume was accepted at the joint luncheon by Waldo W. Braden, Executive Secretary of the SAA. A lead review of this volume is being planned for an early issue of the* QJS. *Wallace's speech presenting the volume to the SAA is printed below.)*

---

Professor Braden, at this time I have the special privilege of presenting to the Speech Association of America a volume of studies which I trust is not only symbolic of the long and honorable history of our subject in centuries past but signalizes the maturity of our subject today and prophesies our scholarship in the decades to come. The volume bears the title *History of Speech Education in America*. It is the immediate product of thirty-six scholars in the fields of Speech and the educational theatre who have labored for six years to present some of

the fundamental facts of the development of their subjects in the public school and college. It is the ultimate fruit of the energy and wisdom of those mentors whose faith in our work and its history led the Association to undertake the project officially. Hence these studies represent more than the time and labors of the Editorial Board and of the contributors; they are a monument to the original Committee on the History of Speech Education, whose members were John Dolman, Jr., Alexander M. Drummond, Bert Emsley, Wilbur Gilman, Ota Thomas Reynolds, Mary Margaret Robb, Lester Thonssen, Russell Wagner, and Giles Gray.

In presenting this volume to the Association on behalf of the Editorial Board, I wish to acknowledge particularly the fine co-operation of our contributors and of our publishers. Many of the contributors are recognized as authorities in their lines of study; they were asked to take a fresh look at their materials, to extend their research, and to prepare new studies; this they gladly did. A few of the authors were asked to undertake what to them were new lines of investigation. They, too, responded superbly. Although it is still too early to know how others will judge their work, we believe that their contributions are worth the close observation and critical analysis which both mature scholars and graduate students in Speech can exercise. We are, of course, particularly grateful to our publishers, Appleton-Century-Crofts, and their editorial assistants, because their faith in this venture has been as great as ours.

Mr. Secretary, if this volume should stimulate in the next ten years new and better studies in the history of our subject, our work will have been well rewarded. The seed may be essential, but it's the harvest which not only multiplies but tests the stock.

## SLEEPING AT CHURCH

Dr. A., of Cambridge, was once rather embarrassed by an occurrence in his congregation. An insane man, who had received a public education, and was strongly attached to the doctor, had observed in the forenoon of a warm summer Sabbath, that several of the congregation slept in time of sermon. To prevent the recurrence of the evil in the afternoon, the maniac, having filled his bosom with windfalls from a neighboring orchard, posted himself in a convenient station in the side gallery, the front gallery being occupied by the college students. Presently after the service commenced, he observed one asleep, and gently disengaging his hand from his bosom, he aimed its contents at the head of the sleeper. This occasioned some disturbance, but when it subsided, a second sleeper's head was pelted with an apple. The preacher observing the occasion of the disturbance, requested his insane friend to desist. "Dr. A.," said the maniac, "mind your preaching, and I will keep the dogs awake." It will scarcely need to be remarked that for some time there was less inclination to sleep in the audience than usual.

*New-York Mirror*, XII (November 15, 1834), 160.

# NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

LELAND M. GRIFFIN, *Editor*

## WINSTON CHURCHILL: IN CRISIS, ELOQUENCE

Halbert E. Gulley

Sir Winston Churchill gives as the moral of his six-volume account of the second world war:

In War: Resolution
In Defeat: Defiance
In Victory: Magnanimity
In Peace: Goodwill

The rhetorician could wish to add a fifth recommendation to describe Churchill's finest contribution to that struggle: In Crisis, Eloquence. It was his eloquence in crisis which made him the symbol of resistance to tyranny. His achievements were recognized by the Swedish Academy when it awarded him last year the Nobel Prize for Literature in honor of his more than two dozen books and the "brilliant oratory in which he stood forward as the defender of eternal human values."

For him, however, the Nobel Prize, his knighthood, and his return to a second premiership come only as a ringing finale to one of the longest and most fruitful public careers of any age. His eighty years have linked the reigns of Victoria, two Edwards, two Georges, and the second Elizabeth. As he walked from the wings, Gladstone and Disraeli occupied downstage center. He shared cabinet responsibility with H. H. Asquith, Joseph Chamberlain and David Lloyd George, great names in Britain, but names associated with an era made remote by more familiar wars. Even Roosevelt and Stalin, his opposite numbers of World War II, are gone.

Few, if any, speakers in history have made so many speeches, or had so many published for wide distribution. Churchill has been continuously a member of the House of Commons since 1900, except for a brief period when he was defeated for office in 1922-23. Of the thousand of speeches he has delivered there and elsewhere, several hundred have appeared in fifteen volumes published at various times by many different publishers. The earliest collection, *For Free Trade*, came out in 1906. Since 1940, publishers have produced almost a volume a year. The latest, *Stemming the Tide* (1953), presented selected speeches delivered in 1951 and 1952.

That Churchill was a young man of promise was forecast early. The first biography of him was A. MacCallum Scott's, written in 1905 when Sir Winston was thirty-one. Since then, there have been many, most of which have been published since 1940. Among the most recent are Virginia Cowles' *Winston Churchill: The Era and the Man*, and Robert Lewis Taylor's *Winston Churchill: The Biography of a Great Man*. The many biographies offer little explanation of his success as a speaker, although Taylor's "informal study of greatness" is perhaps the best in this respect. Taylor comments on his vehement sincerity: "His evident be-

*Mr. Gulley (Ph.D., Iowa, 1948) is Associate Professor of Speech, University of Illinois.*

lief in his words has perhaps never been surpassed by anybody before or since. In fact he is admired yet today for the way he can hold a hostile audience that is silently rejecting his offering in toto." This biographer also presents many examples of Chruchill's conversational skill, concluding: "Unquestionably the rising politician was, and is, one of the most eloquent conversationalists ever known, inferior to the clacking Johnson only in the technical sense that he had no long-suffering Boswell."

The best biographical material about Churchill, of course, is that which he has himself written. His most explicit autobiography is *The Story of My Early Life: A Roving Commission*: (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942), first published in 1930, covering his career before 1908. Reflections and attitudes he recorded in *Thoughts and Adventures* (1932). Here he included a charming piece on "Consistency in Politics" and an enlightening chapter on his campaign speaking. His early concepts of oratory can be inferred from remarks in his one attempt at writing fiction, the novel *Savrola: A Tale of the Revolution in Laurania* (1899). The hero had made many speeches and

> knew that nothing good can be obtained without effort. These impromptu feats of oratory existed only in the minds of the listeners; the flowers of rhetoric were hothouse plants . . . he saw a peroration, which would cut deep into the hearts of a crowd; a high thought, a fine simile, expressed in that correct diction which is comprehensible even to the most illiterate . . . his ideas began to take the form of words, to group themselves into sentences; he murmured to himself; instinctively he alliterated. . . . He scribbled down a rough sentence, scratched it out, polished it, and wrote it in again. The sound would please their ears, the sense improve and stimulate their minds. What a game it was!

Churchill's other writings, too, reveal much about the man. He produced monumental reports of both world wars, giving detailed accounts of the role he played. Some contemporaries thought the *World Crisis*, his history of the first world war, concentrated too specifically on its author; Lord Balfour remarked he had been reading "Winston's brilliant autobiography, disguised as a history of the universe." The final volume of his record of the second war, *Triumph and Tragedy*, has just been published; reception of this work has been kinder.

Along with the wide acclaim for Churchill at the end of his long career have appeared two recent books of particular interest to students of his speaking. H. L. Stewart's *Winged Words: Sir Winston Churchill as Writer and Speaker* is of interest because of its omissions. Stewart has a chapter on "His Platform and Parliamentary Eloquence," but offers perhaps a dozen lines of evaluation and none of explanation other than the suggestion that Churchill's models were his father and Macaulay. The book does comment briefly on the speaker's ability to hold attention and his "exceptional skill in adapting an argument to the receptive system of an audience." Of far greater worth is a volume edited by Charles Eade, *Churchill by His Contemporaries*. In it, thirty-nine persons who were close to Churchill in one capacity or another have recorded their impressions of the man as orator, parliamentarian, broadcaster, conversationalist, political candidate, persuader, humorist, user of words, biographer, journalist, soldier, artist, and so on. Whereas his biographies often repeat anecdotes and observations which can be read in a dozen places, many of these chapters present glimpses of the man which are previously unreported. A short article by Leslie Hore-Belisha, "How Churchill Influences and Persuades," gives especially good insight into the speaker's methods and the rea-

sons for his success. This volume should be valuable even to the casual student of Churchill as speaker. Other critics must add to this excellent beginning by contributing further explanation of his effectiveness.

Sir Winston has reached a dizzy eminence as an orator partially because of the contrast with the speakers around him. In an age of mediocrity, featuring the feeble efforts of the Baldwins, Chamberlains, and Attlees, and, in America, the ghost-written handout, Churchill's carefully prepared and majestically worded orations built, as Sydney Walton has said, "from the foundations to the topstone . . . like a Roman temple" are exceptionally impressive. Yet the paucity of competition is not a whole explanation.

Part of his effect has sprung from his peculiar *ethos*. He is first of all a Marlborough, a direct descendant of John Churchill, the first Duke, one of England's greatest heroes. Sir Winston's father, Lord Randolph Churchill, was himself a well-known political speaker who rose in a brief but meteoric career to leadership of the House of Commons. Through family connections, the young Churchill became a war correspondent and established an enviable reputation as an observer and critic of military operations. His escape from a prison camp at a moment during the Boer War when British successes were minimal made him a national hero, and enabled him to win a seat in the House of Commons at twenty-six. Five years later he was in the Cabinet.

Since then he has held almost every major post in the Government. When World War II came no man in Parliament could match his experience. On the other hand, no member had been such a controversial figure. He had deserted the Conservatives for Liberalism in 1904 and twenty years afterward had crossed back again. He had been dropped from his post as First Lord of the Admiralty before the first war because of the ill-starred Gallipoli episode. He had aroused hostility in the mid-twenties as Chancellor of the Exchequer by his actions during the General Strike of 1926. In the decade 1929-1939 he had alienated most of the House through such matters as his insistence on arming against the Axis and his defense of Edward VIII in the abdication crisis. When war came, however, many of the very qualities which had made him distrusted and unpopular were plainly needed. No one had ever questioned his brilliance, persistence and audacity. In peace, these attributes had caused friction; ministers had always complained that he tried to run their departments as well as his own. In war, the nation needed a man with unswerving confidence in his own judgment who could unhesitatingly manage large affairs.

The clinching aspect of his *ethos* in 1939 was his astounding prescience: in 1914 he had mobilized the fleet before Britain declared war, guaranteeing that the navy, at least, was ready; he had been right about tanks as a weapon; many persons after the inquiry into the Gallipoli campaign felt he had been right also about forcing the Dardanelles and attacking Germany on a second front; above all, for seven years before 1939 he had been predicting in his speeches the very actions of Hitler the nation was now wrathfully condemning. Nor has his ability to analyze the world's problems been eclipsed by the second great war. As everyone knows, it was Churchill who named the "iron curtain" and in his Fulton speech of 1946 alerted the west to Russian ambitions, and who repeatedly pressed for European unifica-

tion. When Churchill speaks, the world listens.

Many other elements, of course, add to his effectiveness. The content of his speeches is invariably solid and arresting. He prepares his speeches with meticulous care, insisting on accurate and complete information. That he understands painstaking research methods is indicated in his two-volume biography of his father, the four-volume work on Marlborough, and his histories of the two wars. From his earliest years, he has practiced this same thoroughness in his speech preparation. After the materials are at hand, he spends as much time as is necessary in arranging and perfecting, often making many drafts of the whole manuscript. He then practices in conversations with his friends; indeed, many of them have complained that his conversation is one long speech.

The aspect of his speaking in which he most obviously excels his contemporaries is his use of language. Here, too, he polishes and revises until the word choice and rhythm please him. With his prodigious memory, he can usually reproduce the phrases exactly as he planned them, even when he speaks from an outline. He has a rich vocabulary and often achieves impressiveness through the use of the precisely accurate and appropriate word. Rhythm, the characteristic of his oral language which accounts in large measure for its impressiveness, he achieves through balance, parallelism, repetition, tautology, and alliteration. His skill as a phrasemaker is well known. Many of his expressions, such as "Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few," and "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat," have become part of the language.

Charles Eade, in the introduction to *Churchill by his Contemporaries,* writes: "He has been mocked and isolated in Parliament and yet lived to see his critics hail him as the greatest parliamentarian of modern times—perhaps of all time. . . . His war speeches will live as long as the English language." We can confidently call him the greatest orator of our times. How he should be compared with the Burkes and Pitts of another age must be decided by a more balanced evaluation when time and prospective lend their ruthless judgment.

BOOKS REVIEWED

*Churchill by his Contemporaries.* Edited by Charles Eade. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954. $6.00.

*Winged Words: Sir Winston Churchill as Writer and Speaker.* By H. L. Stewart. New York: Bouregy and Curl, Inc., 1954; pp. vi+114.

*Winston Churchill: The Biography of a Great Man.* By Robert Lewis Taylor. New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1954; pp. 405. $.25.

*Triumph and Tragedy: The Second World War.* By Winston S. Churchill. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1953; pp. vii+800. $6.00.

THE GARDEN OF ELOQUENCE (1593). By Henry Peacham. A Facsimile Reproduction with an Introduction by William G. Crane. Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1954; pp. 24 [of Introduction] + 254 [of Text, partly unnumbered]. $7.50.

This volume accomplishes three important objects for students of Renaissance rhetoric and English literature: 1) it makes available an exact reproduction of the second edition of Peacham's *Garden of Eloquence,* thus bringing within every scholar's reach an unsurpassed English reference work on some two hundred terms comprising the lore of the tropes and the schemes of style; 2) it supplements that reference work by making available from the first edition of Peacham's *Garden* a reproduction of those terms that the first but not the second edition contains; and 3) it makes both of these reference works more valuable than they otherwise would be by including with them a study by Professor Crane of the nature and sources of the *Garden* and an explanation of the surrounding context of sixteenth-century English rhetoric.

When Professor Crane remarks that "*The Garden of Eloquence* contains the most extensive and accurate treatment of figures obtainable in English," he has the first two of

these objects in mind, and he is in fact defining the utility of the present volume for all literary and rhetorical scholars. Here within a single work are the terms for the figures of style, each term being defined, divided into species, explained, and illustrated from the Bible or the classics. Here is a work to which you can refer your colleagues if they ask you to identify some trope or scheme—unless, of course, you carry these terms in your head and need no reference work on this complex subject. Professor Crane's facsimile reprint takes its place among such other works as Hudson's edition of Hoskins' *Directions for Speech and Style* (Princeton, 1935), Willcock and Walker's edition of Puttenham's *The Arte of English Poesie* (Cambridge, 1936), and Scaton's reprint of Fraunce's *Arcadian Rhetorike* (Oxford, 1950). These works, used in conjunction with original editions of such other English stylistic rhetorics as that by Sherry, Fenner, Angel Day, Blount, and Smith, will give today's scholar as much as he is ever likely to need in answering questions about the lore of the tropes and the schemes in the English Renaissance.

Professor Crane's Introduction is especially helpful in its discussion of the sources of Peacham's terms and illustrations. So far as I know, these sources have never been fully treated before. Professor Crane's thorough and careful analysis of them, is not likely to be surpassed for some time to come.

On another count, however, Professor Crane's Introduction is less satisfactory. He tends to think of early sixteenth-century rhetoric as a somewhat vague and generalized entity rather than as an entity made up of three distinct aspects. For example, in speaking of Peacham's English predecessors, he lumps Cox, Sherry, Wilson, and Rainolde together and treats them as the authors of the four English rhetorics before Peacham. In actual fact, Peacham's only true English predecessor is Sherry. Sherry and Peacham both regard rhetoric as in fact the theory of style, although Sherry also pays 'perfunctory respect to invention, arrangement, memory, and delivery, as having a place in the rhetorical tradition. Thus Sherry and Peacham are members of the family of English stylistic rhetoricians. Cox and Wilson belong to another family—that which defines rhetoric in Ciceronian terms and actually treats it as having invention and arrangement as well as style (and in Wilson's case, memory and delivery, too) among its component parts. The difference between Cox and Wilson, on the one hand, and Sherry and Peacham, on the other, is a difference between a preponderant emphasis upon subject matter and a preponderant emphasis on form, so far as the theory of rhetoric is concerned. This difference must be accounted for, whereas Profesosr Crane's procedure is to treat it as if it did not really matter. As for Rainolde, he belongs to still a third family, that of the formulary rhetoricians, who believed in teaching rhetoric, not by the study of Ciceronian or stylistic theory, but by the study of model compositions involving all aspects of those theories. Rainolde's work deserves attention in the history of sixteenth-century rhetoric, but it deserves to be placed in its own tradition, not in that of Sherry and Peacham.

There is one other aspect of sixteenth-century rhetoric that requires a different treatment from that given it by Professor Crane. That aspect may be called Ramistic rhetoric. Professor Crane devotes a few sentences to "the highly controversial and belligerent Petrus Ramus" and to Ramus' colleague, Talaeus, "with their emphasis on those rhetorical devices which directed their appeal to the emotions." His sentences, however, are not enough. Although he may not approve of Ramus, the point is that Ramus was tremendously important in England after 1574, and the historian of English rhetoric has got to understand that importance, whether he approves of Ramus or no. Professor Crane recognizes that Peacham included certain grammatical schemes in the first edition of the *Garden* and omitted them from the second edition. Professor Crane also recognizes that the omission of the grammatical schemes from the second edition was connected in some way with the theories of Ramus and Talaeus. What needs to be stressed, however, is that Ramus had effected a reorganization of the trivium by insisting that dialectic, rhetoric, and grammar should each keep to its own boundaries, and should each refuse to deal with materials properly belonging to one of the others. Thus dialectic under Ramus' plan assumed exclusive control over the topics of invention and arrangement, even though those topics had formerly belonged also to rhetoric. Meanwhile, Ramus' rhetoric assumed exclusive control over the whole province of delivery and over the tropes and the schemes of style, even though some of the schemes had formerly belonged also to grammar. Ramistic grammar was limited to the topics of etymology and syntax. The difference between the first and the second edition of Peacham's *Garden* is in part at least the difference between a work devoid of concern for Ramus' reform and a work influenced by Ramus' reform. In 1577, when Peacham published his first edition, Gabriel

Harvey's two treatises on Ramistic rhetoric (the *Rhetor* and the *Ciceronianus*) were just appearing in print and had not yet had time to change the ways of English stylistic rhetoricians. In 1593, when Peacham's second edition appeared, Harvey's influence had made itself felt, and had been supplemented by the Ramistic rhetorics of Fenner and Fraunce, and by Ramistic dialectics by MacIlmaine, Fenner, Fraunce, and Temple. Peacham is not a Ramist himself in 1593; but he reacts to Ramism at that time to the extent of omitting from the second edition of the *Garden* certain grammatical materials that Ramism did not allow a work on rhetoric to contain. At any rate, this appears to me to be the explanation for the phenomenon which Professor Crane explains in vaguer and less satisfactory terms.

Despite what I have been saying in criticism of Professor Crane's Introduction, I feel it to be a distinct contribution to our enlarging knowledge of sixteenth-century rhetoric, as his earlier works in this field have been. And it is a decided satisfaction to know that, thanks to him, Peacham's *Garden* may now become a part of every scholar's own personal library. Peacham's Index and Professor Crane's supplement to it make the whole work easy to use for reference.

WILBUR SAMUEL HOWELL,
*Princeton University*

DEMOSTHENES' ORATIONS. Edited with an Introduction by John Warrington. (Rev. ed., Everyman's Library, No. 546). London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1954; pp. xi+292. $1.65.

The speeches here included are 'On the Crown,' the Olynthiacs, the Philippics, 'On the Peace,' 'On the Chersonese,' 'On the Letter,' 'On the Duties of the State,' 'On the Navy Boards,' 'On the Liberty of the Rhodians,' and 'For the Megalopolitans.' This volume (a revision of the 1911 edition) gives us the rendering by Charles Rann Kennedy, who first published a translation of select speeches of Demosthenes in 1841; the speeches contained in the Everyman volume appear severally in two volumes of the Bohn Classical Library published in 1852 and 1855. Kennedy's version was popular for many years; his principles of translation, set forth in the Bohn edition of the Olynthiac and Other Public Orations (London, 1852), make interesting reading. But students will now prefer either the translation by A. W. Pickard-Cambridge (2 vols., Oxford, 1912) or the two volumes of the Loeb Classical Library containing these particular speeches—'On the Crown,' translated by C. A. Vince and J. H. Vince (1926), and the fourteen others translated by J. H. Vince (1930). Not the least virtue of these later renderings is that they take advantage of improvements made in the Greek text since the days of Kennedy's activity. Kennedy's name does not appear on the title-page of the present edition; there is a brief Introduction by John Warrington; the Bibliography does not list the translation by Pickard-Cambridge; the Chronological Abstract of Events during the life of Demosthenes is virtually the same as that in the above-mentioned Bohn edition of 1852, but of the five still useful Appendices there appearing, the present volume retains only one—'Athenian Money and Mines.'

HARRY CAPLAN,
*Cornell University*

THE SOCIAL IDEAS OF THE NORTHERN EVANGELISTS, 1826-1860. By Charles C. Cole, Jr. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954; pp. 268. $4.25.

Sermons, books, pamphlets, and diaries written by the Northern evangelists, and their correspondence with clerical and lay associates are the primary sources the author uses in depicting the social, political, and economic ideas held by this colorful group of 19th century preachers. Clearly organized, and well-documented, the book contains abundant evidence, and draws a lively, vivid picture of the evangelists and their struggles with moral reform, political intrigue, worldly possessions, and the all-absorbing topic of this period—slavery. From an almost unlimited *dramatis personae* the author selects Charles G. Finney, and Lyman and Henry Ward Beecher for the leading roles. In the supporting cast are Horace Bushnell, Jacob Knapp, Francis Wayland, Joshua Leavitt, Peter Cartwright, Albert Barnes, and a number of lesser figures.

Since the author is generous with his interpretations, the book is stimulating and provocative. The final chapter, an evaluation of the evangelists' secular and religious pronouncements on the thinking of the nineteenth and twentieth century American, contains much controversial material. According to the author, the powerful influence wielded by the evangelists in secular affairs during the ante-bellum years steadily declined in the post-Civil War period. A *passé* theology, rendered obsolete by Darwin, contributed to the waning influence of the evangelists in "worldly" and "other worldly" affairs; and as a consequence, mankind turned, for better or for worse, to politicians, generals,

newspaper editors, and businessmen for secular counsel. The "Billy Grahams," acknowledged counterparts of the nineteenth century revivalists, will consider the demise of the evangelist and his method, strongly inferred by the author, to be highly exaggerated.

In a modern application, the author compares our world, divided between East and West, with the world of the nineteenth century citizen, pitched betwixt heaven and hell. The assertion that modern man, equipped with a knowledge of science, is more adequately prepared to cope with his world seems overly optimistic. Perhaps the old school Calvinist felt helplessly impotent in the hand of a God who chose a few for eternal bliss, only to hurl the majority into the flaming pit. There still remained that larger "free grace" group, who possessed a confident assurance which modern man has conspicuously failed to attain.

Even though the author recognizes that his subjects "were most alike in being different," he traverses even shakier ground when he attempts to draw a composite picture of the typical Northern evangelist. Some characteristics ascribed to them were dynamic personalities, dogmatism, an introspective nature, a proneness to exaggeration, and an unbounded faith in the final triumph of holiness. Basically anti-intellectual, their appeal was to the emotions.

Such generalizations often produce half-truths, and encourage the reader to search for the obvious deviators. In particular, the anti-intellectual stereotype needs qualification. This characteristic "held in common" could hardly be applied to Charles G. Finney, the second President of Oberlin College, hailed by the author as "the greatest evangelist of all." Even in the case of Peter Cartwright, the sentiment could more correctly be stated as contempt for some poorly educated missionaries to the West, and a hearty disdain for the theological graduate, or "hot house" preacher.

On the whole this book will be particularly valuable for those interested in the history of American public address. As the author suggests, a similar study of the Southern evangelists might also be profitable, if only to test again the conclusions of this volume. Moreover, one of the multitude of so called minor evangelists might well become the subject for a rhetorical study of major significance.

PAUL H. BOASE,
*Oberlin College*

**INSIDE LINCOLN'S CABINET: THE CIVIL WAR DIARIES OF SALMON P. CHASE.** Edited by David Donald. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1954; pp. ix+342. $6.50.

The newest star in the Columbia University constellation of historical scholars, David Donald, has done a great service for students of history, in providing them with this first edition of the war diaries of Lincoln's great Secretary of the Treasury. While the diaries have been available to scholars at their repositories in Philadelphia and Washington, they have never before been available to the general public.

From the technical point of view, it is an admirable production. The diaries are brief, on occasion almost cryptic, yet Editor Donald has identified people and places with amazing thoroughness and still left an uncluttered manuscript. The notes are admirable, and the index excellent. Mr. Donald's introduction is superb.

The content of the diaries, however, leaves much to be desired. The advertising for the volume, it appears to this reviewer, makes exaggerated claims. For example, the assertion is made that these diaries give "an intimate and detailed record of the inner history of the Lincoln administration." The fact of the matter is that they do not nearly approach the Gideon Welles or John Hay diaries in this respect. There are long gaps in the record: Chase resigned months before the end of the war; and worse still, with the exception of a half dozen important instances, such as the adoption of the Emancipation Proclamation, Chase was so unimpressed with cabinet meetings that he not only made little effort to record their events, but even threatened to cease attending. Much of the real information with respect to the workings of the inner administration of government is more in the nature of incidental information than a planned account of important events.

On the positive side, it must be pointed out that the diaries provide some very valuable insight into important situations, persons, and feelings within the administration. The relationships between Lincoln and Chase, and Seward and Chase, are more clearly and accurately revealed than ever before. The political machinations within the Cabinet, against Lincoln and his policies, and the identity of the people involved, are apparent. Especially notable is the attempt of Chase to run the whole war, militarily as well as financially. His meddlings in the War Department and its business were brazen in the extreme.

Students of public address will not be richly

rewarded in the perusal of this book. There is little reference to the speechmaking of Chase. On the contrary, when he went out on an extensive speaking tour, in the campaign of 1864, his diary does not even record the subjects which he discussed. The student looking for material on audiences, reactions, speech composition, etc., will be completely disappointed. The most frequent comments with respect to public address deal neither with Chase's own efforts, nor those of Lincoln and other public figures, but with the sermons to which he listened with regularity on Sundays. Here, there are occasional succinct observations, which show a discerning interest in the art.

It is, perhaps, unfair to criticize Chase for failure to record in his diaries materials of interest to future students of speech, but it is proper to note that the diaries, while rich in background materials, throw little light on the speechmaking of the Civil War.

WINTON BEAVEN,
*University of Michigan*

STORMY BEN BUTLER. By Robert S. Holzman. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954; pp. xvii+297. $5.00.

Here is the exciting story of Benjamin Franklin Butler, trial lawyer, General of Volunteers, Congressman, Governor of Massachusetts, and presidential candidate, who, in the considered opinion of John Hay, was the "smartest damned rascal that ever lived." Alternately Democrat, Republican, Greenbacker, and Democrat, Butler aroused passionate loyalties and hatreds in his day; and, sixty years after his death, the enigmatic career of the "Beast of New Orleans" still presents the biographer with an arresting study in character analysis.

Professor Holzman gives a space emphasis to Butler's career as a controversial Civil War general, with spirited chapters on his occupation of Baltimore and New Orleans, his "embottlement" at Bermuda Hundred, and his fiasco at Fort Fisher. Included, of course, is an account of his famous "woman order" which declared that any Confederate female who by "word, gesture, or movement" showed contempt for Union soldiers "shall be regarded . . . as a woman of the town plying her avocation"; and the story of his off-the-cuff decision declaring captured slaves contraband of war—a ruling heralded by his radical friends as the abolition of slavery "by epigram." Although such ingenuity and audacity won him an enthusiastic following in the North, it motivated violent hostility in the Confederacy and prompted the Richmond *Enquirer* to damn him as the "beastliest, bloodiest poltroon and pickpocket the world ever saw."

Though always lively and readable, Holzman's narrative relies heavily on secondary sources and is something less than a definitive analysis of this complex politician with a "talent for turbulence." Butler the brilliant trial lawyer receives adequate treatment in these pages, but Butler's important post-war political activities are slighted. His role in radical reconstruction, for example, requires a much more careful consideration. Indeed, more space is needed to explain the actions of this Yankee Democrat who supported Jeff Davis for the presidency in 1860 and urged that he be hanged five years later; who amassed a fortune of seven million dollars while espousing radical financial and labor reforms; who refused the vice-presidential nomination under Lincoln in 1864 for lack of "sureties" that the President would "die or resign within three months after his inauguration."

Students of American public address will note that Professor Holzman is particularly ineffective in describing Butler the speaker. The first orator to "wave the bloody shirt" after the Civil War, Butler owed a good deal of his success to his speech-making. At one place the author concludes that "contemporary accounts indicate that he was a poor speaker"; in another context, he asserts that his audiences "knew better than to expect a poor speech" from the man President Rutherford B. Hayes described as "the most dangerous and wicked demagogue we have ever had."

Ben Butler may never be the subject of a more lively or readable biography; but he certainly deserves a more comprehensive one—a biography which will include an adequate analysis of a major source of his power, his speechmaking.

ROBERT G. GUNDERSON,
*Oberlin College*

WILLIAM FREEMAN VILAS: DOCTRINAIRE DEMOCRAT. By Horace Samuel Merrill. Madison, Wisconsin: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1964; pp. vii+310. $4.50.

Among the awards that can be won by University of Wisconsin undergraduates upon nomination by the professor who is responsible for the "cultivation of the art of public speaking," are the Vilas Medals given annually to a select number who have demonstrated "excellence in intercollegiate debate and oratory."

These medals were established in honor of William Freeman Vilas.

Mr. Merrill's book is the first full-length biography of this man who was a distinguished representative of the nineteenth century in America. As a lawyer, in court, or conference room, Vilas demonstrated intellectual brilliance, learning, sound judgment, prodigious memory, and daring. As a soldier, he served in the Civil War, being mustered out at the age of twenty-three with the rank of lieutenant Colonel. As a lumber magnate, he amassed a fortune in excess of two million dollars. As an educator, he played a significant role in the development of the University of Wisconsin, his Alma Mater. For seventeen years, he taught in the law school, "lecturing with vigor in the fields of evidence, practice, and pleading"; he guided legislation important to the University through the state government while he was an assemblyman, making in its behalf what he considered to be the greatest speech of his career; he was an active regent; and he was a generous benefactor, leaving to the University his entire estate after a stipulated period should elapse.

As a politician, Vilas was the leader of the Democratic Party in Wisconsin for some decades, Postmaster General and later Secretary of Interior in Cleveland's first cabinet, United States Senator from 1890 to 1896. Upon the return of the Democrats to power in 1892, Vilas was at the zenith of his political career. It was not unthinkable that he should be the next president. But with the coming of depression in 1893, he began the steep slide to political oblivion. Vilas had the resilience to experiment in working out the constructive case which had carried him to prominence, but thereafter, he relied solely upon defensive refutation. He was importuned to act otherwise. Burr Jones, a Wisconsin politician, said to him, "At least 9 out of 10 democrats in farming districts would tell you if asked that they are in favor of a *new deal*." (Italics mine.) In 1896 at the national convention, his denunciation of bimetallism as "robbery by law" could not match the fearful bravura of Bryan's cry that he and the other Bourbons should not "crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

As an orator, Vilas had no peer in Wisconsin and few in the nation. He was a debater in college and a founder of Hesperian Society, an eloquent pleader at the Bar, a campaigner in constand demand throughout the state, a keynoter at conventions, and an occasional orator whose forte was the patriotic address.

Mr. Merrill is almost exclusively concerned with Vilas' political career. Indeed, this book may be thought of as a supplement to his *Bourbon Democracy of the Middle West, 1865-1896*, published last year. It describes in more detail the vicissitudes of the Democratic Party in Wisconsin which was devoted to the principle "that the reins of government must remain firmly in the grasp of honest and efficient friends of business." And, of course, it focuses on one representative of that party, depicting him as one who believed in laissez-faire, in gold, in bigness, in railroads, and, logically enough, but not in concert with all Bourbons, in lower tariffs. Mr. Merrill has based his narrative on an exhaustive search of all sources, including extensive manuscript collections. He is expert at identifying Vilas' beliefs and at placing them in the perspective of national politics. In those sections dealing with Vilas' career in the cabinet, he writes with keen insight into the requirements of administration.

When discussing Vilas' oratory, Mr. Merrill centers on the ideas in Vilas' head. Thus, in the chapter entitled "Eloquent Orator," he gives more of its seven pages to politics than to the various canons of oratory. Commentary on the speaking as such is usually incidental to some other purpose and typically is tucked into a sentence whose main purport is something else. Illustrative of this technique are the following verbs which are inserted between parts of quotations: "Vilas *intoned*"; "he *dogmatized*"; "he *admonished*." (Italics mine.) The criticism that does appear is usually in the form of a quotation from some other source; for example, a satirical note from the *Tribune* that Vilas "has shown not what the English language could do, but what it could endure." This book is not a criticism of Vilas' oratory; but it is indispensable to one who may someday venture into that more specific subject.

FREDERICK W. HABERMAN,
*University of Wisconsin*

WOMAN'S LABOR LEADER: An Autobiography of Agnes Nestor. Rockford, Illinois: Bellevue Books Publishing Co., 1954; pp. 307. $3.95.

With the upsurge of interest in communication in industry, the autobiography of Agnes Nestor will be the focus of attention of students of Industrial Relations and of people in industry alike. Everyone in this field will want to investigate the techniques of interpersonal relations of one of the most exciting figures in the history of the labor movement.

Unfortunately, this book was published after the death of Agnes Nestor. To this reviewer

the book seems to be a history of the accomplishments of Agnes Nestor as derived from personal notes supplemented by newspaper accounts of her activities. For this we must make allowances. The motivations, the thinking, the feelings that gave rise to the series of events in the life of this magnetic personality are, for the most part, absent. It was not Agnes Nestor who worked from these notes. Of this we may be sure. Even so, the bare chronology cannot completely obscure the spirit of the girl whose whole life was dedicated to the personal liberty, the security, and the education of women workers, the world over.

At fourteen Agnes Nestor was at work in a glove factory. Almost at once she was caught up in the human facets of industry, and almost at once she began to exert the influence of a dynamic and intelligent individuality.

This book points to one thing which is immediately apparent to the researcher in the field of communication in industry, and that is that there are natural leaders whose academic status has nothing whatsoever to do with their potency in interpersonal relations. What enabled the girl, Agnes Nestor, to pit her wits against the ablest legal minds of the country? What enabled her, without preparation, to respond effectively when Samuel Gompers handed her his gavel and said, "Please preside?" What enabled her to make strategic decisions that shaped the course of the labor movement? What brought this unschooled woman to national and international prominence and finally to the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws?

What characteristics are discoverable in this second-hand autobiography? Simplicity. Reliance upon first hand information. Evaluations based, not on emotional involvements, but upon sound reasoning that stems from reliable evidence. And such personal attributes as indefatigable energy, courage, and a deep sense of dedication to something beyond the personal self. To the student of communication it soon becomes apparent that *personal worth* is the primary requisite to effective interpersonal relations. The teacher in the field of communication would do well to stress the fact that we give ourselves away with every word we utter—whether we are conscious of this or not—that *what* we say must take precedence over the niceties of style and manner—that everyone, regardless of formal training, must speak up in the interest of human goals. This book is documentary evidence that ideas and ideals can be dressed in an infinity of styles and yet maintain their integrity. Communication in industry has taught us that one thing, if nothing more.

The book is worth reading and keeping mainly for one article written by Agnes Nestor, entitled, "A Day's Work Making Gloves." Here is persuasion at its best by a girl in her early teens!

And here, by contrast, is the most disappointing omission in the book:

> One day Mr. Thompson asked me to come to his office to meet with him and Sidney Hillman. When we were seated, he said to me:
>
> "I want you to tell Sidney how you make agreements and negotiate them."
>
> Mr. Thompson knew of my long experience in negotiating agreements for the glove workers where I dealt with the largest employers in our industry. I began to relate our procedure and to give Sidney what advice I could.
>
> Mr. Thompson then said: "Sidney, you ought to see a good deal of Agnes Nestor. She can help you."
>
> It is amusing now to remember that I gave Sidney Hillman his first lesson in collective bargaining.

We need a book that can tell us what Agnes Nestor's autobiography omits.

BESS SONDEL,
*The University of Chicago*

McCARTHY AND THE COMMUNISTS. By James Rorty and Moshe Decter. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1954; pp. viii+163. $2.00 cloth, $1.00 paper.

Anyone who has tried to write anything approaching a rational and coherent appraisal of Senator Joseph McCarthy is aware of the staggering problems involved. The sheer bulk of printed material to be worked through is appalling. Nearly every editor, columnist, feature story writer, and political commentator in the nation has made his contribution to the mountain of McCarthiana. The official record of one brief episode in the McCarthy story, the Army-McCarthy hearings, occupies 2986 pages of fine print. Moreover, the brief public career of Wisconsin's Junior Senator has been so audacious and has touched American life at so many vital points that it is difficult to know just where to take hold of such a complicated subject.

Rorty and Decter have wisely limited their field of discussion. Since McCarthy chooses to present himself to his countrymen as above all else a fighter of Communism, the authors focus

their book upon McCarthy the Communist fighter. More specifically, the book is "a case study of McCarthy in power and of the part his anti-Communism has played in his public career since his assumption in January 1953 of the chairmanship of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations." The case is presented clearly and without heat. The severity of form, linear argument, and methodical marshaling of evidence in support of propositions, are suggestive of a lawyer's brief.

In two solidly documented chapters, "Senator McCarthy at Work," and "The Methods," the authors reveal the true nature of the Senator's alleged campaign against Communism. In the first, they set up three criteria to be applied in judging the sincerity and effectiveness of an anti-Communist campaign, and proceed to show how McCarthy, in his two major investigations (the State Department and Fort Monmouth) failed to measure up to each criterion. In the second, they list ten communists methods of political controversy and produce thirty pages of evidence that McCarthy "has employed not some but all of these methods—and not once or twice but habitually." This, they observe, is startling, for "since Senator McCarthy hates and opposes Communism, we might reasonably assume not only that he would oppose its methods but that he would disdain and forswear their use by himself and by his aides and supporters."

This book owes much of its impact to the fact that it does not try to say everything about McCarthy, but is content to say what is most important. There have been innumerable exposures of the Senator's public and private affairs, but they have not been noticeably effective in changing people's opinions of him. The people of Wisconsin knew all about their Junior Senator's earlier censure by the State Supreme Court; they knew about the Lustron fee, the despicable Maryland campaign, the income tax difficulties, the war-wound hoax, the attack on General Marshall, the frequent distortions of fact. They knew all this and more, but they returned McCarthy to the Senate in 1952 because he had led them to believe that he was getting the Communists out of government. They didn't care about the methods; they admired the results. The only way to disabuse such people (and they are not all in Wisconsin) is to show, as Rorty and Decter do show, that there have been no results, that the Senator is *not* an effective foe of Communism, that on the contrary, he has become a serious liability to the anti-Communist cause.

The final chapter offers some specific suggestions on "How To Combat Communism Responsibly." Most readers will approve the suggestions and will readily agree with the authors that this, and not what to do about McCarthy, is the real issue. But when they assert, "We have said nothing specifically about How To Fight McCarthyism because we believe, very simply, that the only way to counter the effects of a lie is to present the truth, to set the record straight," some impatient readers may wonder how many times the record must be set straight. For Rorty and Decter are not the first to present an imposing array of examples of McCarthy's habitual use of the multiple untruth, his abuse of documents, his attribution of malevolent significance to facts that are not pertinent, his unfounded charges of treason. Much, if not all, of their factual material has appeared again and again in print over the past four years. One wonders how long it will be necessary for men of good will sedulously, painstakingly, to track down, expose, and correct every irresponsible, untruthful statement that has been or may in the future be uttered by the Wisconsin Senator, in order that the point may be made clear that he is not to be trusted. One wonders how many times a man's charges must be proved false before his countrymen are at least willing to subject his subsequent charges to critical examination.

While denying the necessity of instructions in how to fight McCarthy, the authors do offer this advice on how *not* to fight him: "Don't exaggerate McCarthy's power and influence; don't be taken in by his bluff." Such counsel will not seem particularly helpful to those who now find themselves deprived of position and reputation by this demagogue's power, influence, and bluff, but it might profitably be heeded by influential members of the present administration. Rorty and Decter deplore the Senator's aggressive encroachment upon the executive branch, but fail to deplore the apparent willingness of the executive branch to be encroached upon. All of the five examples of encroachment cited (p. 106) might have been prevented if the executives involved, together with their superiors, had taken a stand and refused to be bullied.

The wonder is not that a McCarthy should have appeared in such uncertain times as ours. The real wonder is that a freedom-loving people and an administration headed by a man of unquestionable integrity should have tolerated his unprincipled behavior for so long. This book performs a valuable public service by systematically destroying the myth of McCarthy as a sincere and effective anti-Communist

crusader, and revealing him as a mere power-seeking demagogue.

BARNET BASKERVILLE,
*University of Washington*

JUDGE MEDINA SPEAKS. Edited by Maxine Boord Virtue. New York: Matthew Bender & Co., Inc., 1954; pp. viii+320. $5.00.

When fame strikes, men must choose between serving themselves and serving others. Judge Harold R. Medina made the better choice when his first great case ground to its close. In the words of Judge Ira W. Jayne, who has written the Foreword to this volume, "It was impressive to see the way in which he turned the personal popularity he had won to strengthen the public's confidence in the courts, and to contribute to the solution of the problems of judicial administration." In recognition of this service the American Bar Association's Section of Judicial Administration arranged for the collection, editing, and publication of the twenty-five addresses and sixteen speech fragments under review.

Occasional addresses spanning twenty-three years are here. Through all, whether the subject be "Why Study Latin?" or "Selection of Judges in New York," run themes of faith in America's love of justice, in the humanizing influence of liberal studies, in the law as a vehicle for democratic progress, and in religion as the ultimate source of man's power for good.

Judge Medina avowedly approaches occasional subjects "on the bias," relying on suggestion and implication to carry the burden of persuasive intent; consequently, the addresses in this volume seem almost perversely diffuse and slack, especially when compared with the masterful clarity, order, and emphasis displayed in his famous charge to the jury in the trial of the eleven Communist leaders. But if ideas want force and precision, the probity, intelligence, and good will of the speaker stand forth powerfully in every discourse. The entire collection documents the ancient truth that *ethos* is the most potent of rhetorical proofs.

Editorial notes are confined to descriptions of the occasion for each address or excerpt, references to other sources in which the texts may be found, and a brief comment on the letters received by Judge Medina following the 1949 trial of Communist leaders. A valuable subject-matter index to the speeches and excerpts is provided, but information concerning the accuracy of the speech texts is lacking.

CARROLL C. ARNOLD,
*Cornell University*

THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN HISTORICAL STUDY. A Report of the Committee on Historiography. Edited by Hugh G. J. Aitken. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1954; pp. v+181. $2.25. Paper, $1.75.

In 1946 the Committee on Historiography of the Social Science Research Council issued a bulletin entitled *Theory and Practice in Historical Study*. This bulletin, described by Merle Curti in its Foreword as "a manual designed to help clarify thought about history and to aid historians in teaching and writing it," was the work of a number of distinguished authors, among them Charles A. Beard, John Herman Randall, and Sidney Hook.

Now the Council's Committee on Historiography has published a second report, this time under the title of *The Social Sciences in Historical Study*. Again the list of authors is impressive—Jeannette P. Nichols, Hugh G. J. Aitken, Bert James Loewenberg, Thomas C. Cochran, Samuel Hugh Brockunier, and Shepard B. Clough. Professor Aitken served as general editor.

Intended as an effort "to extend the boundaries of historical thought, to widen the scope of historical investigation, to sharpen historical perspectives, and to clarify historical purposes," the present bulletin finds its focus in a conception of history that is "based on a wider use of ideas and concepts in other social sciences." To this end, its materials are organized under two major heads: (1) "a discussion of the relevance for the historian of methods of inquiry developed in the other social disciplines"; and (2) "a discussion of the nature of history itself as a social science." On a more specific level, attention is paid to such problems as the ordering of events into sequences, the nature of historical change, the use of theory and hypothesis as analytical tools, the ferreting out of causes, and the integration in historical reconstruction of such basic social elements as "structure" and "process."

The detailed criticism of so technical a work must, of course, be left to the trained historian. No interested reader of the report, however, can fail to be struck by its thoroughness and clarity, and by the wide and careful scholarship that went into its preparation. As a special feature of its activities, the committee attempted to reassess, through a series of interviews with representative experts, the limits, methods, central concepts, and current trends of each of the social sciences—anthropology, sociology, demography, social psychology, political science, and economics. The resulting exposition is a

chapter of fifty-one pages that is, perhaps, the most comprehensive and authoritative statement anywhere available concerning the present state of social research. Nor, although space limitations preclude their larger mention here, are the materials on the nature, causes, and conditions of historical change, or the technical aspects of historical analysis and synthesis any less commendable.

For the student of rhetorical criticism perhaps the most significant feature of the report is its unequivocal assertion, frequently repeated, that history is more than a descriptive science—that the reconstruction and recording of events are but the initial steps in the historian's task; that his "truly scientific function begins where the descriptive function stops [and] involves not only identifying and describing temporal sequences [but] also explaining them." Even more pointedly, the authors assert that the purpose of history, broadly conceived, is to discover the answers to problems, to remove discrepancies and felt difficulties of facts; that, like all scientists, the historian finds his impetus not in the desire to record and preserve but to know the *how* and *why* of things.

But aside from its point of view, the sheer fact that a report such as this has been produced has pertinence for persons in the fields of rhetorical theory and criticism, for it is an example of how a mature group of scholars may through co-operative effort look both critically and constructively at the knotty problems of methodology. The great classic statements of method in our field—those by Wichelns, Baird, and Brigance, for example—have characteristically been individual efforts. Is it not time that our energies and insights be pooled? Is it not true that the further development of scholarship in the area of rhetorical criticism depends in large part upon the further development and refinement of method? Perhaps, in addition to the many other useful purposes it will serve, *The Social Sciences in Historical Study* may bestir students of rhetorical history and criticism to undertake a parallel co-operative investigation into the intricate methodology of their own discipline.

DOUGLAS EHNINGER,
*University of Florida*

PRACTICAL PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Eugene E. White and Clair R. Henderlider. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954; pp. x+365. $3.50.

Here is a 'practical' treatment of public speaking fundamentals which goes well beyond the veneer-like depth of many how-to-do-it texts.

The authors have directed their efforts toward both the "undergraduate class and the adult public-speaking course in extension divisions or in industry." In general, the style and language of the presentation is well-conceived and designed for the intended readers. There is a timeliness and informality which is refreshing; however, in scattered instances one might feel that a little too much effort is spent in dealing with chatty bits of material preparatory to a point at hand.

In its excellent organizational structure, the book reflects the author's keen sense of purpose and direction. The text is presented in four sections: Developing the Proper Attitudes, Preparing the Speech, Delivering the Speech, and Adapting Basic Techniques to Various Speech Situations. Each of these sections is prefaced by a concise statement of purpose and by an outline of the subject matter. Individual chapters are followed by suggested exercises and problems.

Almost one-half of the entire work is devoted to the section "Preparing The Speech." Detailed chapters, sometimes heavy with illustrative material, deal with problems of selecting the speech subject, gathering materials, organizing and outlining. The chapter "Discovering and Using the Supporting Materials" is an especially valuable statement for the beginning student in public speaking. Here is a rare instance in which these problems receive a sufficiently full and practical treatment in a beginning text.

The author's designed their text to meet the needs of a great diversity of beginning students in public speaking. They approached this difficult assignment directly and, with basically traditional material, excellent restatement and fresh emphasis, they offer a text well worth the attention of student and teacher.

JOHN P. HIGHLANDER,
*University of Wisconsin*

LISTENING AND SPEAKING. By Ralph G. Nichols and Thomas R. Lewis. Dubuque: William C. Brown Company, 1954; pp. xi+250. $2.75.

Communication courses have been praised, ridiculed, much experimented with and widely talked about during the past ten or fifteen years. The pace of the bandwagon in picking up new adoptions at the college and university level may have slowed somewhat the last five years or so, but the wagon moves on and this reviewer predicts it will continue. Unquestionably, a

goodly number of institutions and departments, as well as individual speech and English teachers, will be able to ignore the communications approach without serious violence to their own consciences or to their success in meeting the needs of their students. But this book by Nichols and Lewis should make it much more difficult now for conscientious speech teachers to be unaware of certain advantages, opportunities, concrete assignments, and methods of correlating speaking and listening instruction.

My list of required readings for "all" speech majors and speech teachers would most certainly include, from *Listening and Speaking*, the Foreword; Chapter 1, "Listening to Learn"; and, Chapter 2, "Ten Components of Effective Listening." The Foreword stresses that "communication is [always] a two-way process," that "failure to understand is caused as frequently by poor receiving as by poor sending." Moreover, studies are quoted to demonstrate that listening can be, and has been, successfully and efficiently taught. Some readers may question the necessity or desirability of the authors' advocacy in these few introductory paragraphs of the entire communications approach ("integrated" listening, speaking, reading, and writing instruction). The basic content of the text concerns only listening and speaking. Most readers will realize, however, that attempts to improve reading speed and comprehension concurrently with the teaching of writing are not essential to the use of this book. Speech teachers and speech classes in "traditional" programs might well appreciate the "definite listening assignments [which] accompany all speech making assignments and are corollary to them. Students will find no time during the class hour for knitting socks, doing trigonometry problems, or reading current magazines."

The first six chapters provide the most helpful, readable rationale on listening principles now available. They go far beyond the ten or twenty pages assigned to listening in many recent speech texts.

The last six of the twelve chapters in the book concern oral communication from the view of the speaker. These pages obviously can not cover the subjects they concern as exhaustively as do most speech texts, but the approach is sound; both students and teachers will find these simple principles clear and useful.

The Appendix makes up approximately one-third of the volume. Twenty speech assignments are presented; each of them has a "corollary listening assignment." Moreover, one page provides space for a "speech outline" to be prepared and written into the text for each of these assignments—and also one page consists of a "delivery evaluation" form for each of the twenty assignments. These forms are suitably varied to meet the needs of the different areas being taught. The "corollary listening assignments" also vary widely; they should prove stimulating and highly worthwhile.

I would not have included five asignments on "directed conversation" if only a total of twenty assignments were to be presented. Six out of twenty assignments devoted to oral reading also seems a rather high percentage. The eight more or less traditional public speaking assignments are well conceived, however, and the authors emphasize that in the usual class about ten or twelve major assignments can be made and instructors should select or substitute assignments to meet their particular situations.

This is a book our profession needed—one which can serve either as an excellent basic text or as a highly valuable reference work for students taking a first course in communication, fundamentals of speech, principles of speech, or public speaking.

EARNEST BRANDENBURG,
*Washington University, St. Louis*

EUROPEAN LITERATURE AND THE LATIN MIDDLE AGES. By Ernst Curtius. Translated from the German by Willard R. Trask. Bollingen Foundation Series No. 36. New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1953; pp. x+662. $5.50.

Students of rhetoric and literature alike should find a mine of miscellaneous information in this provocative attempt to provide an "aerial photograph" of two milleniums. Although the author is avowedly studying the Latin literature of the Middle Ages as a key to understanding its vernacular literatures, the reader interested in rhetoric will find much of interest to him.

As the author points out in Chapter Four, "The reception of antique rhetoric was a determining factor of artistic expression in the West for long after the close of the Middle Ages." Up to the Revolution of 1830, he says, "Europe remained convinced that it could not do without a constantly renewed presentation of rhetoric which should keep pace with contemporary literary production." If a "thesis" could be found in this loosely-organized book, it would probably be the statement that

rhetoric exercised a continuous influence on literature throughout this whole period, from Homer to Hugh Blair.

Most of the book's eighteen chapters and twenty-five Excurses deal with literature *per se*, but almost every section has an important reference to classical or medieval rhetoric. Five chapters deal directly with rhetorical problems: Topoi, Metaphorics, Poetry and Rhetoric, Rhetoric, and Mannerisms. Other chapters, however, make constant references to rhetoric; for instance, a section on "Epic Landscape" notes that medieval rhetoricians' discussions of the three styles dictated the use of the laurel tree as proper in a description using the *stilus gravis*.

Besides the chapters on rhetorical problems, students of rhetoric may be interested in such chapters as Poetry and Theology, Poetry and Philosophy, and The Book as Symbol. In the last of these, Curtius discusses the differing amount of respect for oral and written wisdom held by ancient and medieval man: Curtius notes that Plato in the *Phaedrus* believes written records to be only mnemonic guides to what is already known orally, while St. Francis much later declares *"litterae sunt ex quibus componitur gloriosissimum Dei nomen."*

The student of rhetoric, however, may find it difficult to follow the author's chain of thought once he leaves the five chapters on rhetoric. Each chapter in the book is broken into from four to ten numbered sections, some of which have only a general relation to the chapter's stated subject. The sections are seldom linked to each other by transitions. As a whole, the book is confusing if read consecutively; the impression is that of a volume of essays on one general subject.

The chief value of the book will probably lie in the rich store of fact and provocative criticism which the author's apparently wide reading makes possible. Cicero, Isocrates, Horace, Statius, Ovid and a score of others are discussed along with John of Salisbury, Dante, Isidore, Shakespeare, and Alain de Lille. The plentiful footnotes will be interesting to serious students of the subject, although the lack of a final bibliography makes it necessary to comb footnotes for the author's major sources.

Despite its shortcomings, this book should be a welcome addition to the meager store of English-language works dealing with medieval rhetoric.

JAMES J. MURPHY,
*Stanford University*

READINGS FROM DICKENS. By Emlyn Williams. Introduction by Bernard Darwin. London: The Folio Society; 1953; pp. xviii+164. $3.75. Distributed in the United States by Philip C. Duschnes.

This handsome little book is of interest to Dickensians, to admirers of Williams as interpreter of Dickens, and to all who enjoy specimens of literature selected to be read orally. Embossed in gold on the cover is Dickens in his last reading. Half tones of Dickens and of Williams reading are supplied within the book. The format is a skillful blend of the Victorian and the contemporary.

Assembled in three parts are readings for three evenings. The first part, which includes Mr. Chops and Bob Sawyer, contains the readings Mr. Williams used widely in his tour of America. Part two is composed of less dramatic pieces, and includes Mrs. Gamp and Mrs. Harris—readings more familiar to Mr. Williams' audiences in England and Wales. Part three is the ambitious cutting of *Bleak House*, with thirty-six characters, requiring two and a half hours to read, as given at the Edinburgh Festival.

Dickens' original readings were printed in a series of green paper-backed pamphlets, often sold on the streets before and after performances, for a shilling. Mr. Williams' adaptations are not the same as Dickens used. Dickens could assume that every member of his audience had read, or had heard read, the complete book at least once. Mr. Williams could make no such assumption. He had to make units complete in themselves. Dickens, with his mercurial expression and his powers of interpretation bordering on mesmerism, flitted from role to role in the characters he had created. As he developed as a reader he drew more and more upon the dramatic, culminating in that "two Macbeths," the murder of Nancy by Sykes, a role Mr. Williams has not yet essayed. Mr. Williams emphasizes characterization, mood, and sustained narration. Dickens the reader interpreted Dickens the author; Mr. Williams the actor interprets Dickens the author and reader.

In his generation Dickens stood alone in his dual ability to create and to recreate. Mr. Williams is unique, too, in his art of playwright, adapter, and actor. It is to be hoped such a book as this will encourage others to make adaptations and to read aloud from works of literary merit.

THERESA MURPHY,
RICHARD MURPHY,
*University of Illinois*

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE THEATRE. By Frank M. Whiting. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954; pp. 315. $4.50.

The final word on Professor Whiting's book must be put down first, for whatever qualifications or reservations may be offered, *Introduction to the Theatre* stands out as an eminently sensible and useful book. The author has an unmistakable passion for the theatre and a thorough familiarity with all the arts and crafts of the theatre, but his devotion and knowledge have not obstructed his natural common sense. His enthusiasm has not clouded his perspective. But he does not apologize for theatre studies. He gives them an honored, but not exalted, place in the liberal arts program, exhorting them to contribute to the student's culture as do any of the more conventional academic disciplines. He regards the academic theatre as a mature and stable organization essential to the life of any university community. If professional theatre training occurs concomitantly within this broader cultural framework, well and good, but undergraduate theatre studies, he believes, should not be geared toward professionalism. Whiting has no axe to grind, no evangelical enthusiasm for any particular aspect of the theatre art, no advocacy of any particular type or form of theatre. A well-balanced sensitivity to all theatre experience is his governing precept.

This precept is apparent in the arrangement and proportioning of his material. He starts with the play, then the actor, the director, the theatre building, and finally the staging and scenic devices. This is certainly the sensible order, the order that should be submitted to the beginning theatre student, and clearly the book is designed for an introductory course in the theatre curriculum. In general the author has addressed himself consistently to the uninitiated theatre student, but some excusable breakdowns do occur. For example, the student is assumed to know what ground plans and elevations are and yet be ignorant of the word "proscenium." He is told that "the wall of the stagehouse which divides it from the auditorium is known as the proscenium. This contains the prosenium opening or prosenium arch through which the play is seen."

Some will question, I am sure, the overdetailed attention to some of the technical aspects; for example, the discussion of the clout nail and its proper pattern on the corner block. The sections on stagecraft and lighting might have been more properly balanced with a heavier emphasis on theatre aesthetics.

Others will question the long opening survey-history of drama, wishing that more theatre history and theatre aesthetic had been presented alongside the discussion of the plays. In general I found the treatment of theatre history, as distinct from drama history, less satisfactory—and principally because it received less attention. Of course, any survey of the drama inescapably results in a series of names, dates, and places, and the story and theme elements of plays tend to stand out somewhat too conspicuously.

If the author demonstrates any prejudice in his historical perspective, it is for the drama of high moral purpose and significant human experience. Such an approach gives the theatre an admirable dignity, but it assigns the "lesser" theatre entertainments (melodrama and farce) to an undeservedly inferior position. This is particularly true if one views the theatre as a social rather than as a strictly aesthetic phenomenon.

The reader's judgments of plays and dramatists will naturally not always coincide with those of Professor Whiting. Many will not agree that Galsworthy "wrote some of the greatest realistic drama of all times," nor that Galsworthy's personal life exhibits a balance of serenity and respectability that reminds one of Sophocles." On the whole, however, this reader was willing to subscribe to most of Whiting's judgments, for they derive from mature and sensible mind thoroughtly schooled in theatrical literature both past and present.

The book is handsomely designed, well illustrated, and includes some sixty drawings (by the author) which clarify all the technical explanations. With the attention the publisher has lavished on this volume, no doubt the proofreaders will get busy on the second printing and eliminate such alternate spellings as Capeau, Copeau; Meyerhold, Meierhold.

But whatever minor questions might be raised, *Introduction to the Theatre* provides the best available introduction for the beginning theatre student.

RICHARD MOODY,
*Indiana University*

THE TELEVISION COMMERCIAL. By Harry Wayne McMahan. New York: Hastings House, 1954; pp. xii+177. $5.00.

A new series of publications has been introduced by Hastings House under the general classification of Communication Arts Books. They have a common style featuring informal,

concise writing with a liberal use of full-page illustrations.

The subject matter of this book is too specialized for extensive use in education but all teachers and students of television advertising should find it useful as a reference source. It could also be studied profitably by all educators who are involved in television and by those who wish to develop criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of TV commercials. The writer deals principally with TV film (the statement is made that four out of five TV commercials used by major agencies are now on film). However, much of the content of the book could also appl to live television.

There are several co mendable features of the book. One which deserves special mention is the emphasis on viewer-intelligence. The author, who has had extensive agency experience as writer and producer of commercials for TV, cites a growing skepticism in the viewing audience toward exaggerated claims, testimonials, over-emotionalism, optical tricks, irrelevant gimmicks, and the use of unfamiliar settings and experiences. It is encouraging to read that the new commercials must be based on honesty, believable demonstrations, simple and useful information, a better psychological understanding of the audience, and a desire for better public relations for the advertiser through audience good will.

Five film-commercial production techniques of cartoon, live action, stop motion, puppetry, and photo animation are analyzed separately with costs and advantages of each. Suggestions are given for writing and producing each type. Methods of construction of ten and twenty second station-break spots are also included. There is separate treatment of the audio element in all commercial forms. A practical emphasis is continually focused on the budget and yard-sticks are provided for estimates of costs of production of all combinations of techniques.

The book is expensive in terms of the amount of content which it contains. Yet it is a most challenging and practical presentation and it will not gather dust on the shelf of anyone who is interested in the study of the communications media.

LEO MARTIN,
*Boston University*

APHASIA THERAPEUTICS. By Mary C. Longerich and Jean Bordeaux. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954; pp. xiv+185. $3.75.

*Aphasia Therapeutics,* as may be expected by the title, is mainly concerned with therapy for persons afflicted with various forms of aphasia. For the most part, the book deals with specific methods of testing and treatment.

Only enough theoretical material is given to orient the reader as to the frame of reference used by the authors. Drs. Longerich and Bordeaux believe that the teaching techniques used with the aphasic patient are much more complicated than those used with children. Special emphasis is placed upon the need for the reinvestigation of the functional aspects of aphasia. Some awareness of the psychic as well as the organic involvements in aphasia are also indicated.

According to the authors, aphasia is defined as a ". . . disturbance in ability to recognize audible and visible communicative symbols, or to produce mental concepts in well-planned words, phrases, sentences, or paragraphs by means of speech or writing." Aphasia is approached by Drs. Longerich and Bordeaux from three major aspects receptive aphasia, expressive aphasia, and amnesic aphasia.

The chapter on "Symptomatology" presents the various aspects of the aphasic person's behavior. In the chapter on "Appraisal of the Patient's Capacities," the authors give recognition to the problems of differential diagnosis and the dangers of misdiagnosis. A careful diagnostic study of each aphasic patient is advised. To and in making a differential diagnosis of the type and degree of speech and language involvement, directions for administering a series of twenty-eight tests are specifically stated.

In the chapters on therapy, prognostic factors are stated; therapeutic goals for the nurse are given; and specific therapies for the various types of aphasias are presented in step-by-step procedures.

Techniques of therapy are presented in much detail, including actual word lists for the various steps in therapy. Thirty-seven steps are indicated for the teaching of word-naming to patients diagnosed as having "receptive aphasia." Each step is clearly described. The treatment of alexia, auditory agnosia, apraxia, paraphasia, and amnesia are among other types of phasic manifestations included in the chapter on "Speech and Language Therapy." Fifty-seven specific steps for word-naming are clearly presented for the treatment of apraxia.

The last chapter of the book, "Psychological Aspects of Aphasia Therapy," places proper emphasis upon the importance of mental hygiene for the patient with aphasic symptoms.

The bibliography of additional readings contains ninety-five references. Ten pages make up the Index, which provides a quick method of finding specific tests and techniques of therapy.

Because of the emphasis upon specific testing and therapeutic techniques, this book should be very useful to all persons working with aphasic patients. Although primarily of most value to the speech pathologist, the book should also be instructive to nurses, physicians, and relatives who desire to help the aphasic patient work toward improved language communication. The book also has excellent possibilities for use in graduate seminars devoted to the study of methods of testing and therapy for the aphasic patient.

RUTH BECKEY IRWIN,
*The Ohio State University*

ON APHASIA. By Sigmund Freud. Translated by E. Stengel. New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1953; pp. xv+105. $3.00.

This book is an English translation of a work first published in 1891 in German, and generally not available. In it, Freud develops an interpretation of aphasic behavior as representing levels of depressed functioning controlled in their form by the nearness of the lesion to a "speech centre" or focal area for a language function, which centres outline the periphery of the "speech region." "If situated on its periphery . . . its symptoms are related to its localization . . . it either results in a loss of only one of the elements of speech associations, or it alters the functional state of this element. . . . If the lesion is situated centrally in the speech region the whole apparatus of speech suffers functional disturbances such as arise from its character as an instrument of association. . . ." The levels of depressed functioning Freud takes from Bastian: "(1) Absence of excitability to volitional stimulation, with preservation of excitability through association and to sensory stimuli, (2) Loss of excitability except by sensory stimuli, (3) Complete loss of excitability."

Obviously, this is a book of considerable historical significance in the study of the aphasias and in the study of Freud. It represents a development of Hughlings Jackson's theory, and leads on into most contemporary theory of aphasia, rather specifically toward Nielson. But it is equally valuable as reading for its own sake. Cast in the form of a critique of strict localization interpretations of aphasia, Freud's development of his thesis is able to pinpoint objections very specifically: e.g., "Lichtheim already knew of a common instance which he was unable to fit into his schema, i.e., the combination of motor aphasia and alexia which is too frequent to be attributed to the coincidental interruptions of two fibre tracts." The language is spare but lively: e.g., "Extreme claims . . . for the paramount importance of the motor element of speech, have been refuted by Bastian with the remark that he was waiting until he was shown a case of a person who had been made word deaf through destruction of Broca's area."

A reviewer who does not have access to the original is hardly in a position to talk sensibly about the quality of the translation, but it seems hardly credible that some of its crispness and clarity is not Dr. Stengel's work.

PAUL C. BOOMSLITER,
*New York State College for Teachers, Albany*

PUBLIC OPINION AND PROPAGANDA: A BOOK OF READINGS. Edited for the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, by Daniel Katz, Dorwin Cartwright, Samuel Eldersveld, and Alfred McClung Lee. New York: The Dryden Press, 1954; pp. xx+779. $6.25.

Handsomely bound, legibly and solidly printed in double columns, with a distinguished list of ninety-two contributors, and comprising a wide diversity of studies in public opinion from many and varied behavioral sciences, this valuable compendium represents not alone a genuine bargain but also a well-nigh indispensable desk reference for all who work seriously in conducting research in the social sciences or in assessing the dynamics of public opinion. Comprising as it does carefully selected research studies that have appeared in ten major social science journals and in publications of seven survey associations and thirteen book publishers, this volume brings together what the editors presume to be the best materials on the subject produced in English from 1916 (Bryce's *American Commonwealth*) to the date of final compilation (late 1953).

Because of the editors' own feeling that analysis of public opinion must comprise rounded views from all relevant areas of specialization, your reviewer wrote to Dr. Katz inquiring why speech was wholly ignored. In courteous reply, Dr. Katz wrote, "I am very grateful for your calling attention to a real blind spot in our perception. . . . Another time I think the procedure should be to in-

clude a representative from speech on the active board of editors."

As an interum procedure, it might be worthwhile for the SAA Committee on Speech and the Social Sciences to draw up a bibliography of studies from the speech area on the dynamics of public opinion, and to make this readily available in the *Quarterly Journal* or elsewhere. It surely behooves members of the other social sciences to add to their own reading lists the *QJS, Monographs, ETC, Journal of Communications,* and relevant books published by Speech experts. Meanwhile, it might be worthwhile for writers in the field of speech to present papers to the *Public Opinion Quarterly, Human Relations,* the *Journal of International Opinion and Attitude Research,* and other cognate periodicals.

Of challenging interest to our profession is one finding in a University of Michigan study (technique not described) that only one-fifth of American adults attended any type of public speech during the year preceding the study. Although the report does not say so, sermons surely must be excluded! The report declares of public speaking that, "This channel of communication reaches the fewest people of all the mass media considered in the survey."

The nearly one hundred studies included in the volume are selected primarily to illustrate a wide diversity of methods of opinion research, to point out pit-falls in validation of findings, and to offer suggestions for continuing improvements in technique. Many specific data are presented, from which careful students can deduce important elements in the profile of American public opinion and the nature of group characteristics. Although the penultimate selection finds it necessary to warn that, "the reader should not infer from these findings that research in the social sciences is relatively hopeless," the general tone of the studies is one of buoyant hopefulness that social science research is nearing maturity.

Any critic can complain about omissions. (Shift-of-opinion and leadership-in-discussion studies by speech experts surely ought to be included; and in my own judgment a second-best selection was made from Lippmann's *Public Opinion*). Obviously, too, many of the reports (all of which are complete) would profit from being reduced to mere summaries. The clarity of style and common sense of the initial selection from James Bryce contrasts sharply with the jargon and occasional academic unreality of some of the research reports. Nevertheless, speech staff members concerned with opinion research should welcome this book heartily as an inexpensive, comprehensive, detailed and careful compendium of (almost) the whole broad array of methodologies in the field.

ROBERT T. OLIVER,
*The Pennsylvania State University*

THE AMERICAN CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP. By Colonel Sherman L. Kiser. New York: Pageant Press, 1954; pp. viii+211. $4.00.

Every now and again some retired military officer fulfills what is apparently a common ambition among such people—to write a book which reveals The Secret of leadership, which he has discovered through long years of experience in the armed services. It is probably only the fortunate few who succeed in finding a publisher who will print their words of wisdom.

Colonel Kiser has been one of the lucky ones —luckier, I am sure, than he knows. And how fortunate are we, the public, to have the opportunity to read this opus. For as the foreword so modestly states: "Until now, no one has analyzed the subject of leadership and really discovered the basic elements. . . . The author, by diagnosing Universal Mind, has simplified the subject. . . . We are given the formula . . . to produce a true leader."

Before you jump to the conclusion that you know what kind of book this is and hence do not need to read it, let me hasten to urge those who have an interest in the psychology of leadership not to pass up this volume. Not that one would want to accept the author's concept of "Universal Mind," or waste much time with his chapter entitled, "Our Flag." But rather because the Colonel himself is a rich case study in leadership. He was an officer in our armed forces for forty years, and I have a hunch that he may have been a very good one. The concrete advice that he gives about how a leader should behave in specific situations is good common sense, and reflects considerable impact upon him of a democratic culture. He prefers "leading" to "commanding." He urges that the leader try to understand the follower's point of view, and try to resolve conflicts in a rational manner. He advises leaders to admit their mistakes, and to correct any injustices they may do. He even believes that everyone has the capacity to become a leader.

In spite of all this, the "psychological" rationale which he presents for his principles is thoroughly authoritarian. The "perfect" leader suppresses all emotion, because emotion is an

"evil influence." Universal Mind is an entity which, because it is at one with God, knows the Truth. Hence, a leader who achieves Universal Mind through "positive thinking" (shades of Norman Vincent Peale) will have attained the Truth, and his subordinates, *inevitably* sensing that this *is* The Truth, will be in "harmony" with him and willingly follow.

That a man's beliefs and actions can contain so many curious inconsistencies is, I think, symptomatic of the fact that our American culture, especially as regards leadership ideology, is itself a conglomeration of contradictory thoughts and feelings.

FRANKLYN S. HAIMAN,
*Northwestern University*

SOCIAL SCIENCE IN MEDICINE. By Leo W. Simmons and Harold G. Wolff. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1954; pp. 254. $3.50.

Although this volume says little that directly concerns speech and communication it deals in an impressive way with the stresses which involve speech in human relations and adjustment, and hence, health.

Much new data points to the communication of person-to-person, person-to-group, and group-to-person in building anxiety and tension which result in breakdowns in internal organs or in disease. What happens to the person in relation to his family, occupation, community and culture in time builds attitudes and habits of thinking which connect with cells and organs and the well-being of the whole person. The bearing of mental health upon physical health is traced in detail in respect to breathing, circulation, digestion, the skeletal muscles and the cranial arteries. "It is recognized that stamped upon his personality, built into his reaction patterns and sometimes deeply imbedded in his bodily structures are the impacts of his culture, and the scars of his society inflicted as a consequence of his particular place in life. Moreover, his personal history, more than anything else we can call upon, reveals the conflicts and stresses, and the processes of conditioning by achievements and defeats."

Because it is important that he live up to the expectations of his fellows and play his roles acceptably his efforts are often fraught with tension. If he is unable to fulfill the functions ascribed to him by society or to meet obligations associated with each change of status, he "fails" in the eyes of his fellows, and perhaps also in his own eyes, and suffers mental and emotional stress that may affect his health. "Such socially derived stresses can accumulate slowly over long periods, but they may also accelerate under trying circumstances and reach a climax at a time when success and failure are balanced delicately."

Anything that affects his social standing or self-esteem and causes him great anxiety has correlative bodily reactions. "Any of the countless social relationships which ebb and flow around the individual can at times upset his personal equilibrium and intensify stress." Society always has the power to mar, maim, or even eliminate particular individuals in either sudden and dramatic enforcements of its demands or by slow, subtle, and hidden forces and processes. Society impresses stress upon certain members as truly as it eases stress and provides security for others.

Cases were cited in primitive tribes where death invariably followed the pronouncing of curses upon individuals exactly as the priests had forecast to the victims their fates. All the people who stood in close kinship relations withdrew their support. Post mortems frequently revealed ruptured organs induced from the anxiety of identification of certain symbols with objective reality. Yet frequently noticed is the improved bodily welfare of persons where in the communication networks changed to give them support, recognition, or improved status. Amazing, indeed, what we do to each other through our symbolizing behaviors!

"Fewer and fewer illnesses are now regarded as completely free from personal and social complications that may alter their course. Even a broken leg may involve quite complex personal and social factors that influence recovery." The patient formulates his definitions of himself and his situations in ways which limit and bind his behavior to conform to these unconscious self-manufactured assumptions. Yet this same patient may affect his own recovery with a revision of his assumptions concerning himself and his situation in positive directions.

The authors are careful to point out that the wedding of sociology and medicine has far to go if it is to achieve the inherent potentials. The specialists concerned will probably discover that in the deeper levels of speech and communication are to be found very specific and tangible points to help them achieve their objectives.

ELMWOOD MURRAY,
*University of Denver*

THE WORDS WE USE. By J. A. Sheard. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1954; pp. 344. $4.50.

STRANGE STORIES OF WORDS: Philology for Everybody. New York: Vantage Press, 1954; pp. iv+52. $2.50.

Both of these books deal with the words of everyday speech, bear similar titles, and are aimed at the ordinary reader, not the specialist. There is a great difference, however, between the two authors in their approach to the subject. Schott's book provides a brief tour of the domain of language, Sheard's a careful, lengthy study of the origins and development of our English vocabulary.

Mr. Sheard summarizes the linguistic borrowing that English has done from Latin, Scandinavian, French, and other languages, and relates this borrowing to the social, political, and economic history of England. The most interesting foreign influence on our language, in his opinion, has been the Scandinavian. He shows how much more importance it had in the Old English period than written records with their many Latin "book" words would indicate. Evidence for the intimate mixing of Scandinavian and English lies in the presence of many Scandinavian words in Middle English which have undergone the same sound changes as native English words, and of a Norse dialect used in Scotland as late as the seventeenth century. The author also points to the dual forms of English and Scandinavian that we still use—*whole-hale, shirt-skirt*, etc., the Scandinavian pronominal forms *they, their*, and *them*, and how we cannot say that we *thrive*, are *ill*, or *die* without Scandinavian words.

In his last chapter, he discusses the interesting question of whether English is better off for all of its borrowing. He weighs its rich vocabulary against the looseness of expression that so much choice engenders in those who do not use the language carefully. A more serious disadvantage is the lack of any apparent connection between related words in English, e.g., *eye-ocular, mind-mental, mouth-oral, son-filial*, etc. He questions whether the "international" effect of so many Greek and Latin words is worth the national inconvenience, and reminds us that the purpose of our language is to enable English-speaking people to express their thoughts clearly. Against modern English, he weighs Old English with its inherently rich vocabulary, its adequacy for expressing new ideas, and its capacity for growth through derivation and compounding, and one wonders whether Mr. Sheard is really convinced that the subtlety of modern English is worth the price. Or perhaps he wants the reader to wonder.

Mr. Schott's little book is a smattering of information about words and language study. His purpose of providing a "philology for everybody" is a good one, and he has used anecdotes, brevity, and humor rather well, but the book does not contain a scientific approach to language study.

Both writers, and especially Mr. Sheard in his longer work, needed a chart of phonetic symbols to be used for representing the spoken language. Mr. Sheard's also needed a word index to facilitate tracing word references. In both, the ordinary reader will be troubled by the frequent lack of adequate translation.

ROBERT W. ALBRIGHT,
*Cornell University*

THE WESTMINSTER PULPIT: THE PREACHING OF G. CAMPBELL MORGAN. Introduction by Wilbur M. Smith. Vol. I. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1954; pp. 351. $4.00.

This is the first of a proposed series of ten volumes which is to include 300 of Dr. Morgan's sermons. Volume One contains twenty-six expository sermons preached from the pulpit of Westminster Chapel in London. A wide variety of texts from both Testaments is included.

The pattern of development in the sermons is the same throughout the book. A text is given and placed in its proper setting; the central message and its application are stated, and a brief conclusion is given. Dr. Morgan's method of sermonizing is in part the result of a definitely felt need of his own. In a book by William Shepherd, *Great Preachers*, Mr. Shepherd points out that Dr. Morgan while still a young man lost his religious faith as a result of his scientific studies, and for more than two years was a most miserable person. Out of this struggle came a decision by young Morgan that he was going to stop reading all books about the Bible, and begin studying the Bible itself. For seven years he studied the Bible intensively, and from this experience came an enriched faith which he proclaimed to his generation.

The reading of these sermons helps one understand why G. Campbell Morgan cannot be classified as either a liberal or a conservative, for he is in part both. After reading the first sermon in his series of four on "The Purpose of Advent," one could well believe that a liberal was speaking. To destroy the works of the devil is the theme. The preacher proceeds to show that the Son of God came that he might destroy the works of the devil, which are sins of all kinds, sin being defined as missing the

mark of the highest type of living. A reading of the fourth sermon, which is concerned with the second Advent, convinces one that a conservative of conservatives is preaching: "What of those who have fallen asleep? They are safe with God and He will bring them with Him when He comes."

Illustrations are rarely used, but when one is included it truly illuminates the subject. In a sermon on "The Spirit's Testimony to the World," Dr. Morgan explains that the first time he was ever really conscious of the fact that he himself was spirit rather than body,

> "was in New York, in the Murray Hill Hotel, within five minutes of a great explosion which occurred. . . . In a room on the third floor of that building was my wife. I was attempting to reach that floor, and I felt that my spirit was hindered by my body. I became positively conscious that this body was a clog, a hindrance. . . . I knew in the moment of peril that I was spirit."

More than seventy other books have been written by the author.

THOMAS H. MARSH,
*Southern Methodist University*

## BRIEFLY NOTED

THE CASE FOR POETRY. By Frederick L. Gwynn, Ralph W. Condee, and Arthur O. Lewis, Jr. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1954; pp. xix+449. $2.95.

The title of this book is well chosen for it employs the case method study of poetry. The authors state that the method used in law schools is applicable to the study of poetry. This is a neat approach to the study of individual poems. Many of the poems have critiques by one or more critics. For example, *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* has four pages of criticism. This is bound to be helpful to the student. Another interesting device is the use of several poems to show how they were developed. This section is entitled "The Vision and Revision of Poems." A student's respect for artistry is bound to swell when he sees, for example, how Emily Dickinson compressed twenty lines into eight. College students probably skip appendices, but teachers look at them for teaching helps. Devoted teachers who love their work have built these pages.

I should think that every teacher of oral interpretation would want to own a copy of this book and in many institutions the students might well have copies for use in their oral reading classes to supplement the texts in the field. It is a feast of good things.

LIONEL CROCKER,
*Denison University*

LINCOLN AND PREVENTION OF WAR. By Ralph G. Lindstrom. Harrogate, Tennessee: Lincoln Memorial University, 1953; pp. 25. $3.00.

An ingenious argument, rejecting both the "irrepressible conflict" and "blundering generation" concepts, and a parable for today: had all men, with Lincoln, recognized slavery within states as a matter for *state* sovereignty, and extension into the territories as the only proper matter for *federal* sovereignty, there need have been no Civil War.

J. JEFFERY AUER,
*University of Virginia*

AN AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH. By Richard Henry Dana, Jr. Edited by Robert F. Metzdorf. Introduction by Norman Holmes Pearson. Hamden, Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, 1954; pp. xii+119. $2.50.

The autobiographical sketch here printed in its entirety for the first time was written in 1842. Students of nineteenth century American public address will be interested in this document for its many references to contemporary orators, and also for Dana's observations on his year as instructor in elocution at Harvard College. The editor has done a thorough job of annotation; and a brief but perceptive essay, developing a kind of intellectual or characterological parallel between Dana and Henry Adams, has been supplied by Norman Holmes Pearson.

LELAND M. GRIFFIN,
*Boston University*

HOW TO TALK YOUR WAY TO SUCCESS. By Harry Simmons. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954; pp. viii+224. $3.95.

Like many another "how to" book, this one is, perhaps necessarily, superficial and frustrating. The subject of conference leadership is disposed of in seven pages, for instance, and speechmaking in thirty-six. The twenty-two poorly organized chapters average about ten pages each.

In spite of the promise of his title, the author rarely tells his reader how to do anything. There is an abundance of advice on what to do. The following excerpt is typical: "Follow the logical sequence of events. . . . Run them

in after a good, effective introduction, add a strong climax, and you have your speech. . . . It is up to you to fill in the body of the speech . . . with the kind of material that will accomplish your objective." One might wish that Mr. Simmons had discussed, even briefly, how to determine whether a given sequence of events is "logical," and what kinds of materials accomplish what objectives. Even when the advice is sound, the reader will find little help here in translating theory into practice.

The advice, unfortunately, is not always sound. In order to develop a "dynamic quality" and to produce an "electric vibration" in the audience, the author recommends, for instance: "Raise your voice an octave higher, then move it up and down."

On the whole, however, he dispenses a good deal of practical wisdom, and the book may have some value as a check list for salesmen, for whom it is primarily intended.

CHARLES DANIEL SMITH,
*Syracuse University*

SUGGESTIONS FOR CONTEST SPEAKING. By Anne Louise Hirt. Minneapolis: The Northwestern Press, 1954; pp. 170. $1.00.

In her foreword to this small paper-bound book Professor Hirt defines her purpose as follows: "It [the book] is especially designed for the pupil who has had no previous training in speech, who has no access to classes in which the fundamentals of speech are taught, whose coach has had no training in public speaking or interpretation, but whose preparation must necessarily be largely self-training. It is designed to meet the needs of the teacher who carries a full teaching load and is faced with the problem of time in which to prepare a dozen or more students individually for the speech contest. . . . It is designed to give the unprepared teacher or pupil a solid foundation for further work in the field of interpretation."

These objectives are certainly worthy ones. It is regrettable that the author chose to limit her discussion to declamation and interpretation, omitting the debate, discussion, extemporaneous speech and one-act play contests.

Weaknesses of the book largely center around a tendency on the part of the author to be too positive regarding problems on which authorities are not entirely agreed. Of course the book is not designed for scholars. But it would seem desirable to be very careful about even the information given to high school students. For example, Professor Hirt urges frequent practice of facial expression in front of a mirror. Speech people I know say such practice may lead to artificiality. The author goes counter to practically all recent research in urging "diaphragmatic" breathing to correct "thin, weak voices." She tells us that when the nasal passages are blocked, "there is no resonance."

The section on pronunciation is especially open to criticism. For instance, she contradicts most authorities when she tells us that in the sentence, "A long time ago a man of humble origin became a leader among men" all the *a's* are pronounced like the *a* in *what*.

These are examples of numerous small inaccuracies and dogmatic assertions that mar what could be a fine little help for over-worked teachers.

ELTON ABERNATHY,
*Southwest Texas State Teachers College*

PAN-L-VIEW ON PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE. Designed by Edward J. Ryan. 708 Church St., Evanston, Illinois, 1954. $3.00.

This is not a book, but the distillation of many books on parliamentary procedure in easy to handle form. On two sides of a 12½ by 6½ inch card, which slides within a plastic casing with transparent windows, there are thirty-six parliamentary actions on which eight different decisions may be made.

If a member moves to reconsider, for example, by the simplest sort of alignment of the panel one can in a moment find the rule which governs whether the member must be recognized by the chair, whether the motion can be interrupted, amended, renewed, etc.

Edward J. Ryan is a practicing dentist and editor of the widely read dental journal, *Oral Hygiene*. He is a past president of the Chicago Dental Society.

It is the origin of his interest in this instrument of the democratic process which interested me. I have heard him deplore the undemocratic character of meetings of professional groups. Far too often he had to sit in sessions dominated by a handful of people who could and did use the parliamentary procedures as maneuvers for the frustration of the will and purposes of the majority. It was the ignorance of the membership of their privileges that motivated the design of the device.

I have found the *Pan-L-View* of considerable usefulness.

IRVING J. LEE,
*Northwestern University*

THE THEATRE ANNUAL, 1954. Edited by Blanche A. Corwin, New York: Theatre Library Association, 1954; pp. 76. $1.50.

This slim volume has collected some half dozen articles which should prove of value to both the practical producer of drama and the theatrical scholar. The composition of the publication may be fortuitous, but by accident or design it has achieved an emphasis on acting and performance art which today's theatre can afford to note and emulate.

The talents of the virtuoso (and *improvisational*) performer are the threads binding together Donald J. Rulfs' treatment of "Entr'acte Entertainment at Drury Lane and Covent Garden, 1750-1770"; John V. Falconieri's "The Commedia dell'Arte, The Actors' Theatre"; and Francis Hodge's investigation of the robust character, Nat Wildfire, in "Biography of a Lost Play: Lion of the West."

Similarly, Donald Sutherland discovers an argument for violation of "unity" and "the elevated style" in "The Tone of Greek Tragedy" which if carried to a logical conclusion should result in expanded scope for the living actor of ancient drama.

These scholarly reflections may be straws in the thespian wind. Perhaps the performer is moving toward the dominant position he occupied in former theatres, and ushering out the era of directorial theatre by remote control. At all events the contemporary theatre would not suffer from a stimulus toward more performance-invention.

In the same spirit of housecleaning, it is to be hoped that Orville K. Larson's "A Commentary on the 'Historical Development of the Box Set' " is another step toward the removal of this outmoded stagecraft from the living scene, escorting it to the warehouse for the consideration of the antiquarian. Such a broomstroke could provide *lebensraum* for some of the scenic ideas of contemporary German designers, whose works are surveyed by Hans Rothe in *Theatre Annual 1954's* concluding article. A perusal of at least the illustrations accompanying this last writing should be mandatory in college theatre courses on production and design.

HERBERT L. SMITH,
*Syracuse, N. Y.*

SHAKESPEARE: OF AN AGE AND FOR ALL TIME. THE YALE SHAKESPEARE FESTIVAL LECTURES. Edited by Charles Tyler Prouty. Hamden, Conn.: The Shoe String Press, 1954; pp. 147. $2.50.

The Yale Campus was obviously an exciting place in February and March of last year. The Department of Drama presented *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, directed by Frank McMullan, with the original pronunciation coached by Helge Kökeritz; the Yale Dramat and Berkeley College added *The Tempest* and Dekker's *Shoemakers' Holiday;* many exhibits were arranged; *Omnibus* televised a program to celebrate the Shakespeare Festival, and a series of six lectures, assembled in the present volume, were delivered. Davis P. Harding talked on "Shakespeare the Elizabethan," mainly a study of the Elizabethan audience. Helge Kökeritz gave, in "Shakespeare's Language," a scholarly survey of the little that has been done and the much that should be done in this field of study, which must have made hard listening during an afternoon lecture but which on the page makes provocative reading. Frank McMullan talked informatively on "Producing Shakespeare," being especially interesting in his analysis of his own Elizabethan production of *Hamlet*. Arleigh D. Richards III attempted to show the real significance in Shakespeare's development of "The Early Historical Plays," specifically the *Henry VI* triology. Eugene M. Waith, in "*Macbeth:* Interpretation versus Adaptation," presented an extremely intriguing dissection of Act IV, Scene 3, usually dismissed by critics and omitted in production. With his invariable perception, imaginative grasp and wit, and far more than his usual eloquence, Norman Holmes Pearson advanced what to this reviewer seems the finest study of Shakespeare's most difficult play, *Antony and Cleopatra* (but his favorite—and mine), a study which immediately places itself among *great* Shakespearean criticism. One regrets a major publisher did not present the lectures. But even a Shoe String Press should employ a competent proofreader.

E. J. WEST,
*University of Colorado*

JAPANESE NŌ PLAYS. By Zemaro Toki. Pasadena, California: P. D. and Ione Perkins, Japanese Travel Bureau, 1954; pp. 204. $3.00.

Nō is a form of ancient Japanese stage art "characterized by the use of masks and by dance and song performed to the accompaniment of instrumental music." This six hundred year old art has changed very little since its inception and to understand either its appeal or its highly stylized conventions, the Western observer today needs a guide. Such a guide is this new and profusely illustrated publication of the Japanese Travel Bureau, and one which

should make the viewing and the understanding of this ancient art at once more profitable and more pleasurable.

The text (a re-written and enlarged version of an earlier publication on Nō by the Bureau) discusses the historical background and present characteristics of Nō, including the stage, costumes and masks, and the styles of production. A discussion of the actors and their training and techniques, the rhythmic chants and orchestral accompaniment, should be interesting both to the novice and the advanced student of Nō. Chapters on appreciation, classification and literary significance of the Nō are included. For the traveler in Japan, the list of Nō stages with the addresses and usual times of performance will be a valuable adjunct.

Dr. Toki, a professor at Waseda University and director of Hibya Library, brings to his work a sensitive and sincere appreciation of this ancient art, and while the English translation is sometimes strained and awkward, the volume presents a compact yet fairly comprehensive picture of this unusual art form. The discussion of masks and their use is especially well handled, and the illustrations (150 black and white, seven color plates) are much superior to those in the earlier publication.

BETTY MCGEE VETTER,
*Arlington, Virginia*

MINIATURE PLAYS. By Madge Miller. Anchorage, Kentucky: The Children's Theatre Press, 1954; pp. 150. $3.00.

Four of the children's classics, *Pinocchio, Snow White, Robinson Crusoe,* and *Puss in Boots* were expertly adapted by Miss Miller for the Knickerty-Knockerty Players of Pittsburgh as "Miniature" plays lasting no more than an hour in playing time. These and several other short adaptations were played at public schools, women's clubs, men's service clubs, and community children's theatres, and were immediately booked for return engagements.

Here for the first time are four examples of the miniature play. These plays will prove interesting and useful in school situations, as well as in community undertakings and club activities.

CARRIE RASMUSSEN,
*Madison, Wisconsin*

THE FIRST BOOK OF STAGE COSTUME AND MAKE-UP. By Barbara Berk. New York: Franklin Watts, Inc., 1954; pp. 45. $1.75.

A very gay and useful book for young actors, which could be of very great help to teachers, playground directors, camp and community recreation leaders and children themselves. Ideas for skits, carnivals, amateur circuses, parades, plays and other special events are suggested in the way of easily made costumes and make-up. Where costume and color will lend glamor and drama to an occasion suggestions are easily found in the book. It is full of ideas. It is well written, clever, and has a good index.

CARRIE RASMUSSEN,
*Madison, Wisconsin*

A SYLLABUS OF STAGE LIGHTING. By Stanley McCandless. New Haven, Connecticut: Whitlocks, Inc., 1953; pp. 129. $6.00.

This is the eighth edition of this plastic-bound booklet. It follows the pattern of past editions, with the addition of material on late developments in lighting. Outline form is again followed with abrupt, technical terminology used throughout. The author in his preface still feels that the time is not ripe for a genuine text on lighting and that this form is all that can be done with the material at the moment.

Like most other texts in the field, the book reflects the abundance of technical knowledge concerning lighting and the relative scarcity of aesthetic and psychological data. A few gestures are made in this direction, but there is no real attempt to cope with the problem. Perhaps this is one of the author's reasons for still refusing to make a book out of his outline.

The technical material contained in the book is, by and large, excellent. It is concise, well organized, and remarkably complete. Moreover, it is savored with just enough historical data to enable the instructor to give his students a sense of continuity with past theatrical productions. Many items seem to cry for illustration but outline form and high cost seem to have eliminated them. The section on lighting equipment layout for a limited budget might arouse some controversy. This reviewer, for one, would like to see more spotlights and fewer borderlights and foots on such a stage if he were to work thereon.

WILLARD BELLMAN,
*Washington University*

SPEECH PRACTICE BOOK FOR SPEECH IMPROVEMENT AND SPEECH CORRECTION. By Gladys Brazie. Portland, Oregon: J. K. Gill Company, 1954; pp x+154.

The test of the usefulness of a speech practice book is threefold: is it well motivated, is it

carefully organized, is the material not only effective for the correct production of sounds, but also suitable for a given age group?

In Miss Brazie's book the motivation appears to be good. As she says in the Preface, there is nothing new about the use of jingles for speech therapy, but children enjoy jingles and riddles so this approach would seem to be useful.

The organization is adequate. There are two sets of sound tests covering all sounds in all positions. There is a chapter entitled Phonetic Order Jingles in which consonants, vowels, and diphthongs are presented in Jingle form. Additional exercise material consists of relaxation (Lazy-bone Jingles), jaw exercises (Open Jaw Jingles), lip exercises (Limber Lip and Pucker Lip), and tongue exercises (Nimble Tongue). There are also Troublesome Word Jingles, and Jingles for Special Days, including all holidays. Older children are provided for in a set named Not Too Young Jingles.

I wish the jingles were better. Some are charming, but many depend upon constant repetition of the same word or phrase, and too often they do not rhyme.

A more serious fault, however, is the use of "tongue twisters." Miss Brazie objects to "loaded sentences," but does not hesitate to use:

Oh silly Willie won some woolies,
So they named him Woolie Willie.

and

He saw the sea; the sea saw him
A sailing seal was he.

Children with *l* and *s* difficulties would have a very confusing time with such materials, as they would be unable to make the adjustments rapidly enough. The result would probably be continued mispronunciation.

The explanation of the material, which is included in each chapter, will be helpful to the classroom teacher, and the careful indexing will be useful to everyone.

RUTH B. MANSER,
*New York University*

FOUR STEPS TO BETTER HEARING. By W. Richard Miles. San Francisco: Miles Publishing Company, 1954; pp. 77. $2.25.

According to the author, the purpose of this little book is to present as much as possible of the non-technical information on "Hearing" and the "Hard of Hearing" in a practical outline approach to problems that confront the hard of hearing. Such a task in so rapidly expanding a field of knowledge is difficult. In less than one hundred pages it is impossible. Five chapters on the admission of hearing loss, the need for action, remedies, adjustment, and general information are organized to lead the newly handicapped person through the experiences essential for rehabilitation.

Written in an extremely easy style, simplified to primer level the book will be of interest, though unrevealing to the experienced speech and hearing therapist. The book may serve as an introduction to those who have lost their hearing and wish to know what to do next.

ALBERT WINFIELD KOCH,
*Boston University*

THE NEW SOUTH AND HIGHER EDUCATION. Edited by the Department of Records and Research, Tuskegee Institute. Montgomery, Alabama: Paragon Press, 1954; pp. 145. $2.00.

It is apparent that *The New South and Higher Education* reflects the primary concern of preserving the proceedings of the 1953 Fall inauguration of Luther Hilton Foster as fourth president of Tuskegee Institute. This school, if you remember, was established through the efforts of the noted Negro educator, Booker T. Washington.

The book's sub-title phrase, "A Symposium and Ceremonies Held in Connection with the Inauguration . . . ," summarizes the material's sweep.

The volume includes a first section dealing with speeches and added comments of a symposium, the topic question being, "What are the Implications for Higher Education of the Changing Socio-economic Conditions of the South?" This discussion is structured by a group of men whose names rank high among those who have given serious consideration to pertinent problems which prevail in the southern portion of our ever changing nation. The ideas of these men are chiefly concerned with population distribution, reorganization of southern economy, rights of citizenship, and changes in sectional attitudes.

Occasionally the discussion veers from its guidepost as some of the symposium speakers stress too sharply the economic advances made in the South to the near exclusion of open concern for the serious problems involved; or, as other discussants enthusiastically emphasize the plight of the Negro minority to the exclusion of attention to the socio-economic pattern of the South and the implications for higher education. Still, it is the first section of eighty-four pages which gives the book its universial appeal.

Part Two of the book presents the inaugural address for the ceremonies delivered by Howard Thurman, Dean of the Boston University Chapel. Part Three completes the edition with the usual installation speeches of challenge to the incoming college president, of investiture, of customary greetings from various friendly organizations, and concludes with the new president's inaugural statement.

WILLIS N. PITTS, JR.,
*Boston University*

AUDIO-VISUAL METHODS IN TEACHING. By Edgar Dale. (Revised edition). New York: The Dryden Press, 1954; pp. ix+534. $6.25.

Dale's book is the long awaited revision of the 1946 edition, which was noteworthy for its phenomenal sale and the probability that it secured the foundations of audio-visual education established during the war. The *Revised Edition* is really a new book, although adhering to the basic structure of the first edition. Edgar Dale, who is Professor of Education at Ohio State University still treats the "theory," the "materials," and the "classroom applications" of audio-visual instruction.

The book is based upon the principle that *all* teaching can be improved by the use of audio-visual materials. The section on theory explains "why" this is the case. In it Dale presents his concept of good teaching and the relationship of audio-visual experiences to the learning process. The section on materials describes in detail the characteristics, uses, and contributions of the various kinds of experiences and learning materials.

Whereas the first two parts are applicable to all teachers, the third part studies ways of promoting learning in the different subject matter fields. The chapter on "English and Reading," although of some value to specialists in speech, is somewhat limited in its application. The speech teacher will find more guidance from a reading of the entire book and a transfer of the multitude of ideas to his own teaching problems.

This is an important book for anyone engaged in the communication of ideas and information to individuals and groups. Although designed particularly for audio-visual classes in teacher education institutions, its scope is much greater. Specialists in related areas of human communication should not be deceived into thinking that it has no relevance other than the education of future teachers. For Dale's insights into the communication process are great, and his role in shaping the direction of communication media has been significant. The book is readable, comprehensive, beautifully and intelligently illustrated, and filled with sources and references of books, articles, and audio-visual materials. It is the kind of book that will be opened frequently and that will reward the reader with ideas of proven worth for teaching and the transmission of knowledge and beliefs.

WILLIAM H. ALLEN,
*University of Wisconsin*

MULTIPLE COUNSELING. By Helen Irene Driver. Madison, Wisconsin: Monona Publications, 1954; pp. x+280.

According to the author this book is designed to assist those who organize and lead discussion group projects focused on human relations and personal growth in preventive mental hygiene and therapeutic programs. It will also be of interest to those in counseling and guidance, as well as teachers of speech, who should be acquainted with the use of group therapy as it was practiced with 121 participants having a variety of personal problems.

While the author is enthusiastic about the use of members of a group to aid each other in rehabilitation, she insists that an expert counselor lead the group and that this same counselor should have private conferences with each member of the group to discuss his problems or matters pertinent to his own group activity.

The major part of the book is divided into three parts: organization and procedures in personal growth projects using group discussion; effective leadership in multiple counseling projects; and multiple counseling techniques and materials. There is an appendix with fifteen multiple counseling projects which seemed to be the most significant part of the book even though the judgments concerning each one were subjective.

WESLEY WIKSELL,
*Louisiana State University*

A DICTIONARY OF LINGUISTICS. By Mario A. Pei and Frank Gaynor. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1954; pp. 238. $6.00.

Messers Pei and Gaynor have produced a volume which they quite correctly maintain will be a handy reference for students and workers in philology, phonetics, phonemics, grammar, historical linguistics, and modern language studies.

Running to 238 pages and including some

4000 entries, the book treats grammatical terms, names and descriptions of major world languages and dialects, as well as terms of historical and descriptive linguistics. It is especially strong on geographical and dialectic coverage. The publishers have done an excellent job on typography and set up.

While on the authors' own admission the dictionary is not meant to be either exhaustive or definitive, there would seem to be two aspects it could profitably incorporate. First, only the very sophisticated reader grounded in several different orthographic systems could manage correct pronunciation of the more exotic family branches and dialects by the romanization as given. Some type of pronunciation guide would be most helpful.

Secondly, the last five years have indicated definitely that the linguist henceforth will have increasing use for instrumental and mathematico-linguistic terminology to meet on common ground with the communication theorist and linguistic engineer.

The increasing number of students who are combining linguistics with instrumental disciplines would welcome a glossary of technical terms done as well as those already appearing.

In summary it may be said that the book fills a definite need, and so far as it goes does it quite well.

JOHN J. DREHER,
*Ohio State University*

TRANSITIONS IN AMERICAN LITERARY HISTORY. Edited by Harry Hayden Clark. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1954; pp. xi+479. $6.00.

"How and especially why American literature changed historically from one center of emphasis to another." The volume is composed of seven chapters—on such themes as "The Decline of Puritanism," "The Decline of Neoclassism," "The Rise of Romanticism," "The Rise of Transcendentalism," etc.—most of which were developed from papers read at the 1948 meeting of the American Literature Group of the Modern Language Association.

A TREASURY OF PHILOSOPHY. Edited by Dagobert D. Runes. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1955; pp. 1280. $15.00.

"The selections cover the whole span of recorded philosophy, from the Sixth Century B.C. to the present day." Representative excerpts, generally brief, with some appearing in English translation for the first time. In addition to the selections, biographical material is presented for each philosopher, along with a listing of his major works and an estimate of his "place and importance in the history of philosophy."

## BOOKS RECEIVED

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS ACCEPTED BY AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES. 1952-1953. Edited by Arnold H. Trotier and Marian Harman. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1953; pp. xvi+305. $6.00.

DAVID HUME'S POLITICAL ESSAYS. Edited with an Introduction by Charles W. Hendel. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1953; pp. lxiv+166. $.75.

JOHN C. CALHOUN: A DISQUISITION ON GOVERNMENT, AND SELECTIONS FROM THE *DISCOURSE*. Edited, with an Introduction, by C. Gordon Post. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1953; pp. xxxv+104. $.75.

THOMAS PAINE: COMMON SENSE AND OTHER POLITICAL WRITINGS. Edited with an Introduction by Nelson F. Adkins. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1953; pp. liii+184. $.75.

HAMILTON, MADISON AND JAY ON THE CONSTITUTION: SELECTIONS FROM THE FEDERALIST PAPERS. Edited by Ralph H. Gabriel. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1954; pp. xv+231. $.90.

THE TOOLS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE. by John Madge. New York: Longmans, Green, Inc., 1953; pp. x+308. $4.75.

ACADEMIC PROCESSION. By Ernest Earnest. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, Inc., 1953; pp. 368. $4.00.

THE STANDARD BOOK OF SHAKESPEARE QUOTATIONS. Compiled and Arranged by Burton Stevenson. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1953. pp. 766. $7.50.

THE BOOK OF COSTUME. By Millia Davenport. New one-volume edition. New York: Crown Publishers, 1948; pp. xii+958. $10.00.

GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY. By Douglas H. Fryer, Edwin R. Henry, and Charles P. Sparks. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1954; pp. xix+300. $1.50.

# SHOP TALK

LOREN REID, *Editor*

THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA adopted at the Chicago meeting a new constitution, to go into effect in 1956. Essentially it is the document printed in the October issue of the *Journal*, corrected and refined by two- or three-score changes in wording.

Strange and unfamiliar phrases will gradually come into the vocabularies of Association members. Policy is no longer to be determined by an Executive Council, of some forty members, but by a newly-created Legislative Assembly, to be five times as large. And the presiding chairman of the new group is a new officer, a second vice-president who now succeeds automatically to the first-vice presidency and then to the presidency. The old Executive Council, for some forty years the work horse of the Association, no longer continues after 1955. Executing actions, as opposed to policy-making decisions, are now to be placed in the hands of a new "Administrative Council."

"Interest groups" are now also an important part of Association structure. Interest groups will be organized to represent each of the widely-varying activities of members; petitions are already afloat to organize members interested in discussion and debate, speech education, general semantics, and others. Some of these interest groups will be sponsored by already-existing national associations. These groups will have a major part in the planning of the convention program, and will give their expert attention to the advancement of teaching and research in their fields. Already the Executive Secretary is busily preparing special application blanks, to speed the approval procedure of the new units.

Many other constitutional changes could be noted here, but they are to be reported in the *Journal* by others. By the time of the Los Angeles meeting, every member of the Association will be in possession of full facts about the new document.

The adoption of the new constitution was a high-priority item of business at the Chicago meeting. A day-long discussion of the document, held on December 26, produced several mimeographed pages of amendments of the version that had appeared in print. All of this discussion was in preparation for the evening meeting, held at 7:30 p.m. on Tuesday, December 28, at which the fate of the new venture was to be left to the membership.

The constitutional session was a dramatic and a historic one. Early arrivals found the ballroom dark, as the management had not turned on the lights; an electrician was quickly sent for, to pull the switches. Soon a hundred people or more were on hand, and President Karl Wallace called the meeting to order. In his preliminary remarks he quietly explained the magnitude of the problem confronting the group. Pads and pencils were made available so that those wishing to prepare further amendments could write them out. Executive Secretary Braden distributed extra copies of the constitution and of the accompanying mimeographed material so that every one present could follow the discussion. Magdalene Kramer, a past president of the Association and chairman of the committee, rose to give a

thirty-minute exposition of what it was all about. In the front row sat Wilbur Gilman, another past president, author of an important *Journal* article on Association structure, and one of the prime movers in the committee, to give moral and verbal support as needed. Joseph O'Brien, of The Pennsylvania State University, a master parliamentarian, was on hand to advise about any knotty problems that might come up.

Somewhere during Magdalene Kramer's honest and forthright exposition, the Association passed the point of no return so far as the old constitution was concerned. Certainly at the opening of the session one might reasonably have expected at least a close vote either way. But those who might have been hesitant or fearful probably caught a little of the speaker's enthusiasm and conviction, and found their doubts being tempered. When she finished, an article-by-article perusal was begun. Many, many questions came from the floor: some in search of information, some in search of argument; but whether information or argument, the data and the reasons supplied by Wallace, Kramer, Gilman, Braden, Norwood Brigance, and others seemed entirely believable and reasonable. Paul Bagwell, the Executive Vice-President, made a plea, tinged with eloquence, that brought applause.

The article-by article scrutiny continued; but along about 10 p. m. many members seemed suddenly to feel that the examination had been penetrating enough, and that nothing was to be gained by continuing the discussion. Accordingly, even before all the articles were reviewed, and with no special consideration at all of the by-laws, the chair relayed the suggestion that the vote could now appropriately be taken.

The moment's silence followed. No one else appeared to want to speak. The key questions had all been asked; the important changes had all been debated. The pads and pencils had never been used; those meeting on December 26 had done their work well. The Tuesday evening assembly seemed content to change the titles of two groups: "executive council" was changed to "administrative council," and "area group" to "interest group." The president's call for the aye vote met a considerable chorus; by then nearly three hundred people were present. The call for the noes met a notable and emphatic and distinguished silence. There were also notable and emphatic and distinguished expressions of relief, colored with mild amazement, on the Braden, Wallace, and Kramer faces.

After a year, the responsibilities of directing the destiny of the Speech Association of America will fall upon the largest group of shoulders ever to bear them. New names and faces now have an opportunity to appear on the scene, to examine Association policies with a fresher view and a brighter look. As the Los Angeles convention comes to an end at the close of 1955, a new set of founding fathers will begin to take over, who will need the patience, the wisdom, and the imagination of folks like Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, and you.

---

REGIONAL AND STATE ASSOCIATIONS have an important assignment to perform that will help the new constitution get under way. At their meetings during 1955 they should recommend to the SAA Nominating Committee, to meet in Los Angeles, candidates for geographical areas, to be part of the first Assembly, in Chicago, December, 1956.

---

EVERY TEACHER OF SPEECH will find meetings of interest on the program of the annual convention of the Central States Speech Association on April 1 and 2 at the Hotel Jefferson in St. Louis. Plans have been completed for an expanded program carefully arranged to avoid schedule conflicts between sectional meetings relating to any one area.

Six sectional meetings are sponsored by the American Speech and Hearing Association; four by the American Educational Theatre Association; three by the American Forensic Association; three by the National Society for the Study of Communication; and in addition, a wide variety of programs sponsored by the Central States Speech Association itself.

New this year is a three-hour period devoted to speech activities for the elementary classroom which will enable the elementary teacher to discuss and observe a variety of topics ranging from speech correction techniques to creative dramatics and movie making. This program is scheduled on Saturday morning, April 2, for the convenience of the public school teacher.

Another innovation is the program on Friday afternoon dealing with special areas of speech training for ministerial candidates.

Other areas represented in the CSSA convention program include: communication; forensics; interpretation; public address; radio;

secondary school speech programs; speech and hearing; television; and theatre.

---

THE FUND FOR THE ADVANCEMENT of Education is continuing its High School Teacher Fellowship program by offering approximately 200 fellowships to public secondary school teachers for the academic year 1955-56. The Fund hopes through these fellowships to strengthen secondary school classroom instruction and to stimulate widespread consideration of the purposes, the means, and the ends of the liberal studies in secondary education. Under this program each recipient will be enabled to devote a full academic year away from the classroom to activities designed to extend his own liberal education and to improve his teaching ability.

As in the past three years, individual awards will be made to able public secondary school teachers for the purpose of carrying forward a year's program of self-development. This purpose might be furthered, for example, by an imaginative program of study, reading, or other original work, possibly in conjunction with other secondary schools, colleges, or universities, government or industry. Fellowships are available in the humanities, the social studies and the natural sciences.

Forms for individual applicants, school superintendents and for local nominating committees are being distributed to superintendents in all high school districts throughout the country. A limited number of additional forms may be obtained from the National Committee on High School Teacher Fellowships, 655 Madison Avenue, New York 21, New York. Individual applicants should not apply to the Fund for the Advancement of Education, but only to their superintendent of schools or local nominating committee. The amount of the fellowship award will take into account the regular salary the teacher would receive during the school year (excluding summer, night school, or other "extra" work), but not less than $3,000, and reasonable allotments for other expenses.

---

AN ALL-TIME RECORD enrollment participated in Oklahoma University's Speech and Drama Activities Conference for high school students on November 4-6. The total exceeded 600. It was sponsored jointly by the Department of Speech, School of Drama and the Extension Division. In addition to an inspirational speech by Carl Albert, former national champion high school and college orator now serving in Congress from the third Oklahoma district, the program included a symposium on the current high school discussion and debate topic, demonstrations (with critiques) of each of the fourteen speech activities sponsored by the Oklahoma High School Speech League; and laboratory sessions in debate, extempore speaking, interpretation, and several other events.

---

NEARLY TWO HUNDRED part-seekers, including students, faculty members, and alumni, came out during Berea College's homecoming weekend in November to read for 20 major speaking parts in Berea's symphonic drama, *Wilderness Road*, to be given this summer in celebration of the college's one-hundredth year. *Wilderness Road* is the newest Paul Green play and will be directed by Sam Selden. It will run for 60 performances from June 29 until September 5.

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA plans to complete this spring a new, three-story building to house the speech and music departments.

The University Theatre will occupy the upper two floors of the central part of the building. The theatre will have a seating capacity of 350 and a large and completely equipped stage, three observation and control rooms in the rear of the theatre, and built-in lights in the ceiling to serve as spotlights.

The speech department, located in the other wing, will contain five class rooms, two seminar rooms, seven offices and double departmental offices, and three additional offices for the theatre staff. The speech clinic will be located on the ground floor with rooms for individual and group training and double rooms for testing and fitting of hearing aids. The facilities include a recording studio and laboratory, and a speaker system throughout the whole wing.

Behind the Union Building a new extension is being added to house an educational TV station, to go on the air about November 1. A construction permit has been granted for channel 7 and installation is under way; and a request has been made for the allocation of channel 2 to Andalusia for educational use.

The radio studios in the Union Building are being expanded to cover approximately 5,500 square feet and a 200-foot tower just back of the building is under construction for television operations. A small instructional studio, with closed circuit equipment, will be used for training.

---

WISCONSIN COLLEGE OF THE AIR features four new courses being offered this year to Wisconsin's State Stations listeners: "Freshman Forum," "European Culture," "Roman Life and Literature," and "Mind of the Writer."

"Freshman Forum," moderated by Frederick Haberman, chairman of the speech department, is heard Tuesday and Thursday mornings at 11 o'clock. Faculty members of the University lecture on the general topic, "What We Stand For." Class discussions which follow each broadcast of a lecture are also aired.

"European Culture" is introduced by Robert Pooley, chairman of the Intergrated Liberal Studies department, on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons at 2 p.m.

Third program in this year's curriculum is the "Roman Life and Literature" series, conducted by Paul MacKendrick, Classics department. Heard Mondays and Wednesdays at 11 a.m., the lectures are interspersed with dramatic supplements prepared by WHA script writers and enacted by Radio Hall players.

Also in the dramatic area is the new "Mind of the Writer" series. Harry Glicksman of the English department prepares a narrative portrait of a writer's life and experience, then a dramatic episode from one of the writer's works is enacted by members of the Radio Players group. The series has been well received by Wisconsin listeners and offers excellent opportunity for students to obtain radio experience in drama.

---

BEST STORY of recent weeks comes from Dr. Arthur Adams, president of the American Council on Education. During the war some 130 institutions were involved in the navy V-12 program, offering course work to several thousand men. Dr. Adams said that at the end of the first term the navy chiefs had to transfer several thousand men from one unit to another or from naval units to supply corps and midshipmen's schools. "We worked out an elaborate operations chart," he said, "and submitted it to the Defense Transportation Administration. We were told flatly that the transfers could not be made; transportation was simply not available. Finally we decided just to give the men five days' leave and order them to report at the end of that time to other stations. Every one reported on time.

"We never knew how they did it," Dr. Adams continued. "We surmised that some of them had ridden on overcrowded trains: others had taken buses; others secured rides from their parents or hitch-hiked; some may even have walked. But individually they performed a feat beyond the power of the Federal Government."

---

GRADUATES AND UNDERGRADUATES at the University of Missouri make extensive use of the facilities of KOMU-TV for instructional and laboratory purposes. Courses include introductory classes taught by G. Ben Paxton, classes in advanced production and a graduate seminar in television programming taught by Robert Haakenson, and upperclass and graduate classes in television drama and television design by Donovan Rhynsburger and Elmer Bladow. Station officials and employees instruct students in all phases of station management and operation. Members of advanced classes assume full responsibility in planning and producing closed-circuit telecasts.

---

TEACHERS OF persuasion will find intriguing the essay in the October *Fortune* entitled "How to Fire an Executive." The methods described come under two headings: the non-rhetorical (assign him to a job outside his field, then either freeze him out or dismiss him for incompetence; or send him on vacation and while he is away fill his office with filing cabinets) and the rhetorical (candidly dismiss him but tell him you are not going to state the reasons, because he wouldn't agree with them anyway, and why start a debate?) Various shadings of both these techniques also are discussed.

High-light of the essay is the inference that, when dismissing is to be done, corporation presidents should conduct the interviews in an atmosphere which suggests that the corporation is helping the executive find a better position somewhere else. This approach makes the interview a discussion and not simply a firing.

The best way to fire a poor executive is not to hire him in the first place. This advice may seem flippant but comes from experience with SAA placement. Many appointing officers will not employ an instructor or a professor without the most careful kind of inquiry among those who know the applicant. A few, not so systematic, sometimes invite an applicant to accept a position for which he is not temperamentally or academically suited. Thus department chairmen, deans, and corporation presidents alike create personnel problems and then spend soul-tormenting hours wondering how to solve them.

---

SHORT BIOGRAPHY OF A PROFESSOR, from *Genetics and the Races of Man*, by William C. Boyd: "Gregor Johann Mendel was born in Austrian Silesia in 1822 . . . He became a priest in 1847, and studied physics and natural science at Vienna . . . From Vienna he returned to his cloister and became a teacher in the *Realschule* at Brunn. As a sort of hobby he made hybridization experiments with peas and other

plants . . . After years of patient experimenting . . . he reached important conclusions in regard to heredity, which we refer to as 'Mendel's Laws.'. . . He eventually became abbot, and his scientific work ceased."

---

FOOTNOTE TO THE HISTORY of ghostwriting: Brian Tunstall writes in his biography of Chatham that once a spurious copy of a speech of George II was published. The King expressed the hope that the punishment would be light, as, having read both versions, "he liked the spurious speech better than his own."

---

HERE IS A NEW SWITCH on the old saying of Mark Twain about his father. "Last September," a freshman declared the other day, "Professor Z wasn't worth the powder it would take to blow him up. Now he's marvelous. He has certainly learned a lot about teaching in the last three months."

---

SHOP TALK'S SCOUTS report that book authoring isn't so lucrative as it used to be. More books are being written in every field, from freshman English to advanced mathematics. Thus the market is divided. Moreover, dealers in second-hand books are energetic. Their organizations are nation-wide. One chairman asked a publisher for a desk copy for a new instructor. The publisher sent one, but added that his firm hadn't sold a copy of that text on that campus for five years. Plenty were being used —but they weren't coming from the publisher's warehouses.

Why not start a counteroffensive by urging students to keep their books? If the professors chose good texts, students will have a good nucleus for their personal libraries. Books about history, language, science, drama, speech, and other ingredients of the college curriculum, have lasting value. A good book about public speaking, or interpretation, or television, has a world of information and advice between its covers. Moreover, unless a student is in serious financial difficulty, he makes a poor bargain to dispose of his texts at the customary distress-selling prices. Best argument of all, of course, is the reward that comes to those who learn to love books. "Only hold a book before my nose, says Socrates, "and you may lead me all round Attica."

---

THE CURRENT ENGLISH USAGE Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English is engaged in getting out a *Dictionary of Modern American Usage*. The Speech Association of America, along with the American Dialect Society, the Modern Language Association, and the Linguistic Society of America, has given its official approval of the project. Margaret M. Bryant of Brooklyn College writes Shop Talk that individual help is now needed from teachers of speech; and Charlotte Wells of the University of Missouri, formerly on the liasion committee of SAA with NCTE, also endorses the project.

Standard American usage since 1925, with particular reference to divided usage in matters of morphology and syntax, is being studied. Typical problems are: *slow* vs. *slowly*, agreement of subject and verb, pronoun and antecedent, *already* with past tense, *can't help but*, *different than*, *gotten*, *kind of*, *too* and *very* with participles, past tense and past participle forms of strong verbs. Problems of pronunciation, dialect, and meaning are excluded.

Participants are asked to examine a limited corpus (books, magazines, newspapers, or transcriptions of standard speech), to list on 4 x 6 slips occurrences of assigned items (and usually the occurrences of alternatives, for relative frequency counts), and to analyze the data to discover whatever principles are involved. Relative frequency counts on particular items at different times are useful to uncover changes in usage and from different places to uncover geographical differences. For example, it would be significant if it were discovered that *stadia* and *stadiums* were fifty-fifty in 1930, and that *stadiums* outranked *stadia* by four to one in 1950 (in comparable usage). Also the high relative frequency of an expression (e. g., *like for you to*) in some authors, publications, or speakers and low relative frequency in others might reveal regional difference. Agreement of some verbs and subjects might depend on whether the verb or subject precedes in the sentence. There may also be a difference in style, or between literary and popular magazines, between religious and humorous columns, between Rotary and baccalaureate addresses, between sports writers and music critics. Low frequency of an item in speech and high frequency in writing might indicate the label "literary," whereas the opposite might indicate that the expression in employed in spoken English.

The Committee needs, particularly, helpers who have access to recorded talks, forums, and the like and can listen to the records and count the split and unsplit infinitives, the *as if's* and *like's*, etc. Studies may be made of speech, live or recorded, as well as of printed matter. The usage of a variety of people on various subjects in diverse styles is desired. Teachers

of speech who have access to transcriptions of standard American speech and who are primarily interested in the spoken language are especially wanted.

If there are any who would like to take one or more items and listen for them in recorded material, faculty meetings, political speeches, sermons, etc., noting the education of the speaker, audience, and occasion (or have students do this, either for term papers or master's theses), write to Professor Bryant. This undertaking will be useful to every teacher concerned with the usage of the English language in this country, to the elementary and secondary teachers of English, speech, and the language arts, to college instructors in speech, composition, communication, and literature, and to the language specialist interested in the study of linguistic change and public attitude toward language forms. This dictionary is also for the general public as well as for the teacher. If you will take one item, write Margaret M. Bryant, One Montague Terrace, Brooklyn 1, New York.

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN PLAYERS are announcing the rules for the 1954-55 playwriting contest. Information may be secured from Nancy Oakes, contest chairman, 770 Langdon Street, Madison 5, Wis.

---

SHOP TALK CALENDAR

Spech Association of America and American Educational Theatre Association: Hotel Statler, Los Angeles, December 28, 29, and 30. SAA will meet in Chicago in 1956, in Boston in 1957, in Chicago in 1958. All of these meetings will be held on the traditional December dates, except the 1957 Boston meeting, scheduled for the last week in August.

Central States Speech Association: St. Louis, Hotel Jefferson, April 1 and 2.

Southern Speech Association: Memphis, Hotel Peabody, April 4 to 9.

Speech Association of the Eastern States: New York, Hotel Statler, March 31, April 1 and 2.

New York State Speech Association: Buffalo, Hotel Statler, March 25 and 26.

Executive secretaries of national and regional associations are invited to send in 1955 and 1956 dates as selected.

---

THE FIRST TELEVISION PERFORMANCE presented by the Wisconsin Players, dramatic organization on the University of Wisconsin campus, was telecast Sunday, December 12, over WHA-TV, educational Channel 21 in Madison. The Players performed Euripides' classic "Medea" under the sponsorship of the University of Wisconsin department of speech and WHA-TV.

The program featured original music by Donald J. Voegeli, music director of WHA; original stage design by students of Warrington Colescott, department of art education; and an original dance routine by Orchesis and the University of Wisconsin department of dance under the direction of Louise Kloepper and Ellen Moore. Translation was by Walter Agard, classics department. Fred Buerki, speech department and technical director of the Wisconsin Union Theatre was in charge of stage construction.

The idea for the program was conceived by John Dietrich and John Highlander of the Wisconsin speech department, who felt a need for training and extra-curricular work in television in addition to university courses. Professor Dietrich produced and staged the program and Gary Nathanson handled camera direction. The presentation was filmed for future possible national distribution.

---

THE OKLAHOMA HIGH SCHOOL Speech League has approved the addition of a contest in oral analysis of public address and has modified its traditional contest in extempore speaking.

The modification of the latter event provides that students may designate one of six areas of concentration and shall be allowed to draw three topics from the area preferred by the student. The new event, Oral Analysis Of Public Address, is designed to emphasize the ability to analyze and address plus the ability to present that analysis in the form of a well-organized and well-composed speech.

---

THE ANNUAL PENNSYLVANIA Interstate Debaters' Congress will be held at Penn State March 10-12. Formerly a state wide event, the meeting has now been opened to universities and colleges outside Pennsylvania.

The Congress is a model student legislature, not a debate tournament. Each school in attendance submits a bill on one of the two Congress topics. This bill is then examined, along with others, in committee sessions, and the joint product is presented on the floor of the assembly, debated, amended, and adopted or rejected. A number of awards are given: four sterling silver Keystone keys go to the representatives most effective in floor debate, and a silver gavel to the young woman delegate judged to be superior both in subject matter

discussion and in personal charm. For information about the Congress, write J. F. O'Brien, at The Pennsylvania State University.

---

IN 1947 THE WISCONSIN IDEA THEATRE QUARTERLY was launched by the Wisconsin Idea Theatre of the University of Wisconsin. Its first issue was in mimeographed form, but the magazine lived on. In almost 8 years the *Quarterly* never missed an issue. It grew, became respectably produced and won friends and support within the state and abroad. Initially, Junius Eddy, now producer for Karamu House in Cleveland, was editor. Then Ronald Gee assumed the editorship and developed the publication, now one of the oldest of the regional theatre magazines. Recently the *Quarterly* became *Wisconsin Stage* and has a new format. The editors, Gee, Robert Gard, and Edward L. Kamarck, would like to correspond with anyone who has material suitable to the publication.

---

THE SPEECH DEPARTMENT of the University of Wisconsin's Milwaukee branch is carrying on its classes and activities in new quarters on the third floor of the Milwaukee Extension Division's recently completed administration building. Designed for future expansion as rising enrollment and expanded course offerings demand, the available space on the entire south side of the third floor was planned to insure maximum use. The quarters include two large classrooms separated by a soundproofed pair of rooms which are equipped with disc and tape recording apparatus and facilities for radio instruction. All four rooms contain television and FM radio antenna receptacles, microphone jacks, monitor speakers, and signal lights. The wall separating each classroom from the central control room includes a double-pane window.

Professors R. H. Myers, chairman, and T. J. McLaughlin teach regular courses for full-time day students as well as special adult evening courses in public speaking, persuasion, radio, and voice improvement.

---

THE IVY LEAGUE Debate Conference, composed of forensics organizations at Brown, Princeton, Pennsylvania, Columbia, Harvard, and Cornell universities, has adopted as its special task for the year the strengthening of home-and-home debating through special efforts to secure audiences for the debaters held on each campus. Representatives of the associated forensics groups have exchanged views and experiences relative to publicizing intercollegiate debates and otherwise making these events more attractive to college students and the general public. Member schools have agreed to use more than one debate resolution during the season, to experiment with debate forms other than the traditional, and to seek out community and academic groups before whom the Ivy League debaters might appear. This movement to popularize debating was initiated by the Cornell and Princeton debate associations, the former advised by John F. Wilson of the Department of Speech and Drama.

---

THE EIGHTY-FOURTH Congress convened last month, and likewise various state legislatures; so the music of maiden speeches is abroad in the land. Most famous maiden speech of recorded history was delivered by the Earl of Rochester in the reign of Charles II. "My lords," he began, full of dread and apprehension, "I rise this time for the first time—the very first time. My lords, I divide my speech into four branches." At this point stagefright overwhelmed him, and he fumbled nervously at his notes. Finally his shaking frame found a voice. "My lords," he continued, "if ever I rise again in this House, you may cut me off root and branches and all for ever."

Maiden speech to end all maiden speeches, however, was delivered by the great Joseph Addison in the Irish House of Commons. He began: "Mr. Speaker, I conceive . . ." but could not go on, such was the awesome nature of this new experience of speaking. Bravely, and in louder tones, he took a fresh start: "Mr. Speaker sir, I conceive . . ." and again broke down; and there were now a few ironical cries of "Hear, hear!" He began once more: "Sir, I conceive . . ." but could go on no further, and resumed his seat. Across the way an opponent immediately gained the floor and retorted: "Sir, the honorable member has conceived three times and has brought forth nothing."

---

AT A STATE RADIO COUNCIL meeting held last fall in the Capitol at Madison, Wisconsin, Harold B. McCarty, director of the Wisconsin State Broadcasting Service, presented a $10,000 check from the Emerson Radio and Phonograph Corporation to Henry L. Ewbank, State Radio Council chairman and professor of speech at the University of Wisconsin, who accepted it on behalf of WHA-TV. The Emerson grant of $100,000 is being divided equally by the first ten stations to inaugurate the broadcasting of non-commercial educational television. WHA-TV, was the fifth educational television station to go on the air in the United States.

IN AN ATTEMPT to improve the educational value of interschool speech events, the Oklahoma High School Speech League has adopted a compromise between the traditional first-second-third ranking system and the superior-excellent-good-fair-poor ranking system for all of its district and state events.

James Robinson, the new League Director, had experimented with the system for seven years while serving as chairman of the department of speech at Northeastern State College—one of the state's six elimination or qualifying districts. The compromise provided that students shall still be ranked first, second, and third as well as superior, excellent, etc., but that no rankings are to be announced other than the top three, i.e. everyone else will be fourth. However, all the ratings will be posted as has been true with one-act plays for years and all music events for years.

The membership also voted by an 85 per cent majority to have a single critic judge in each event in the finals. This policy will be followed this year if the funds are adequate to bring in enough outsiders to the job.

To improve the educational value of the program further, a 75-page handbook has been prepared this summer and will be put in the hands of all members as they renew their membership in the fall. The handbook contains rules and regulations, copies of all critic evaluation sheets, suggested evaluation criteria for teachers and students to study, and a section of suggested teaching aids and sources of material.

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA Department of Speech and Drama and the Virginia High School League are co-sponsoring a series of five dramatic and forensics clinics. These clinics, held in different areas of the state, are designed to assist high school directors of co-curricular work in dramatics, debating, public speaking and oral reading. Members of the University staff conduct demonstration sessions, using local high school students, in each of these four areas, and follow up with a discussion period based upon the techniques used in the demonstrations.

---

SPEECH FOR TEACHERS is the title of a new course being offered at the University of Virginia this year. Carrying either advanced undergraduate or graduate credit, the course focuses on the nature and development of speech in both its normal and abnormal aspects, with emphasis upon classroom methods for speech improvement and handling of minor defects. The course is being taught on the campus and in extension by James M. Mullendore, director of the Speech and Hearing Center.

---

THE BETA UPSILON chapter of Tri Sigma sorority at the Pennsylvania State University has taken the Speech and Hearing Clinic as its local service project. The chapter has provided recreation equipment and facilities for patients in the adult rehabilitation program, and assisted in cases of personal hardship. An alumnae group is working on a project of redecorating several clinic rooms.

---

THE TENTH INTERNATIONAL Congress for Speech and Voice Therapy will take place in Barcelona, Spain, September 3 to 7, 1956. Those practising in the field of speech and voice therapy and in allied professions are invited to attend. Wendell Johnson of the State University of Iowa is among those now scheduled to give papers.

Those desiring further details about the Congress should apply to the organizing secretary: Dr. J. Perelló, Provenza 319, Barcelona (9) Spain.

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA has just opened a newly-remodelled building to house the Speech and Hearing Clinic, the Program for Exceptional Children, and the Children's Reading Clinic. Stanley Ainsworth is chairman of the speech correction area at Georgia.

---

A THREE-WEEKS television and film training institute for next summer has been announced by the Radio-TV-Film department of the University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla., in conjunction with Station WTVJ and Reela Films of Miami. Courses in live television and film production will be held from July 11 through July 31. Instruction will be by numbers of the WTVJ, Reela Films, and University staffs.

Sydney W. Head, chairman of the University of Miami Radio-TV-Film department said the institute is designed primarily for professionals in public communication who want to understand the basic problems involved in TV and motion picture presentation.

Participants will be mainly educators, public relations and advertising personnel, church and civic leaders, and radio station personnel preparing to transfer to television. Advanced college undergraduates may earn five credits.

---

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY Speech and Hearing Clinic has announced three special programs for the 1955 summer sessions. The an-

nual Symposium on Current Problems in Speech and Hearing will be held during the second two weeks of the Intersession, June 20 to July 1, and will be devoted to therapy with pre-school age stutterers and speech therapy for the cerebral palsied. Guest lecturers will participate, and students may enroll for credit.

Students will have a chance to obtain practicum experience with various speech and hearing problems in two residential therapy programs. A diagnostic and training clinic for pre-school hard-of-hearing children and their parents will be held at Camp Easter Seal from June 12 to 26. A six-week residential program for school-age children with speech and hearing problems will be held on the Penn State campus during the Main Summer Session, July 5 to August 3. Details about the summer programs can be obtained from the Speech and Hearing Clinic, Pennsylvania State University, State College.

---

AT THE REQUEST of directors of speech of the various colleges in Oklahoma, an Oklahoma Senior College Forensic League has been organized and will hold a tournament this year at the University of Oklahoma on April 25-26.

There will be four divisions in debate and a school may enter one team in each of two of the four divisions. The divisions are as follows: an "A" division for men, "A" division for women, a "B" division for men and a "B" division for women. The A division will be a sort of championship flight and the B division will be restricted to relatively inexperienced teams. Separate divisions are planned for extempore speaking and oratory.

---

WAYLAND MAXFIELD PARRISH of the University of Illinois, writes a special correspondent to Shop Talk, is a modest man. And so, a testimonial luncheon held during the SAA Convention in Chicago by the Speech Department of the University of Illinois to honor Parrish's retirement in June could have been painful to him. But Professor Parrish, feeling "young at heart," enjoyed his "academic demise" by scolding his friends and colleagues for celebrating by taking a "sledge hammer to kill a fly." In truth, he enjoyed it so much that he recommended that everyone there try "to have your funeral arranged before you are too far gone to enjoy it." Spluttering an injunction that Toscanini sometimes gave to apathetic musicians, Parrish urged, "Whatever you do in the field of speech, put some blood on it," as he threw the sword to the younger generation.

Parrish was among a great concourse of old cronies and younger cronies. Lee Hultzén of the University of Illinois, Everett Lee Hunt of Swarthmore College, and Marvin T. Herrick of the University of Illinois—all old cronies—were on hand to honor him. They did some sermonizing on topics that represented Parrish's interests of many years: Phonetics, Interpretation, Rhetoric as a humane study. Incidentally, the complete texts of these "sermons" will appear in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* in due time.

Marie Hochmuth, one of Parrish's former students and a colleague at Illinois, ribbed Parrish with exercises from his own books. No longer endangered by his "grumble that sounded a bit like a Collie dog trying to decide whether the occasion called for sport or for an offensive," she took her old teacher to task for telling her while she was writing her master's thesis under his direction that she wrote "just like a German."

Richard Murphy, a colleague of parts of four decades, who knew his man "too well to try encomium," described Parrish as a "clean-desk man," and a man of "first principles." He bore down hard on Parrish for being a "Doctor of Philosophy, that's what you are," and a man of "integrity."

Parrish's teacher, Herbert Wichelns of Cornell University, showed up, having just got a fresh haircut "to honor Max." Wichelns accused Parrish of writing with "lucidity and grace" and of "having a mind that knows what it's after," even a mind capable of exercising "judgment." He growled a bit about the "muddiers of the waters . . . rushing into print," and put Parrish on the side of the angels who do not "conduct their education in public."

The "bouquets" to Parrish will be published in *The Speech Teacher*, along with the sword with "blood on it" that Parrish tossed to the younger generation. Mrs. Parrish, wearing orchids, has decided to keep her bouquet. She thinks she earned it for putting up with Max's ebullient friends and colleagues.

Karl R. Wallace, chairman for the occasion, ended the program with "warped rhyme" in the manner of Ogden Nash:

To Wayland Maxfield Parrish and Greeta,
Our affectionate, respectful, though doggerel meta,
Our tribute is done, we hope it's been fun,
We thought of naught finer and neata.

ADELPHI COLLEGE announces two workshops for the 1955 summer session, both during the July 6 to August 12 period. The Summer Theatre Workshop will consider the areas of acting, directing, voice and diction, and stage design and stagecraft. The Speech Correction Summer Workshop will study the application of learning theory to specific problems of stuttering, delayed speech, autism, articulatory disorders, and childhood aphasia.

EARLY LAST JUNE the Department of Speech held its first Speech and Hearing Conference on the campus of the University of Mississippi. Designed to inform teachers in particular and the public in general of the need for a training program for teachers of speech and hearing handicapped children, it featured M. D. Steer and Betty Ann Wilson as guest speakers. Members of the State Department of Education, the medical profession, and public school officials also appeared on the program as speakers and chairmen. John Paul of the University of Mississippi directed the conference.

A NOTE ON THE APRIL SHOP TALK

As the April issue of *QJS* is the last to be published this school year, the Editor of Shop Talk renews his invitatiion to departments to send in contributions about the year's activities. Material should be received before March 1 if possible. Please put each item on a separate sheet.

KIPLINGER'S *Changing Times* advises convention goers how to be in two places at once; arrange with fellow delegates to swap by mail carbon copies of the postconvention reports that they turn in to their organizations. Norwood Brigance calls our attention to another way to spend a convention, as reported by Conrad Hilton in the January, 1955, *American Magazine*. At a certain, unnamed meeting, two men discovered that they were old school chums. "That first night," writes Hilton, "they drank toast after toast to their friendship, so that when it came time to retire they had reached the saturation point—and a little beyond. To their amazement they discovered that their rooms were right next to each other, but by this time they couldn't bear to be separated. They took a fire axe and hacked a hole in the wall. It was an expensive evening, but the two guests seemed to feel it was worth it."

THE CATHOLIC THEATRE CONFERENCE will hold its biennial convention at the University of Notre Dame on June 13, 14, 15, 16. Sister M. Angelita, Immaculate Conception Academy, Davenport, Iowa, general chairman, is assisted by Wm. J. Elsen, Notre Dame University. Many members of CTC are active members of SAA. The complete program will appear later.

THE OFFICE of the Committee of Clinical Certification of the American Speech and Hearing Association was transferred January 1 to the campus of the University of Missouri. Charlotte G. Wells, director of the University of Missouri Speech and Hearing Clinic, has succeeded Eugene T. McDonald of Pennsylvania State University as Chairman of the Committee during 1955. Helen L. Kreigh has been appointed assistant to the Chairman. Those interested in applying for clinical certification by the American Speech and Hearing Association are urged to study the certification standards published in the *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders* for June, 1952.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI held its ninth annual High School Debate Workshop on the campus in December. Under the direction of Wofford Smith, the high school question was analyzed and discussed from the point of view of case building and reference materials. Panels in documentation and case building were held and members of the University debate teams conducted exhibition debates. Ernest Payne and members of the speech faculty assisted Mr. Smith in carrying out the details of the Workshop.

MISSISSIPPI HAS SECURED two visiting professors under the provisions of a grant by the General Education Board at the University of Mississippi for further development of its Liberal Arts Program. During the spring semester, 1954, Professor Ronald Mitchell of the University of Wisconsin was guest professor at the University of Mississippi. Professor Mitchell assisted in the playwriting courses, took charge of the acting classes to develop a study of period styles of acting, taught a course in Restoration and Eighteenth Century Theatre, and directed a major spring production, Congreve's *Love for Love*. In the spring semester of 1955 A. Craig Baird of the State University of Iowa will be visiting professor of Public Address. Professor Baird will teach courses in Persuasive Speaking, in the History and Criticism of American Public Address and assist with the introduction to graduate study courses. In addition he will

work with the University Scholars giving several public lectures, and conduct seminars with University students generally.

---

FOR SEVERAL YEARS Adelphi College has been developing a course in the Humanities to serve as a general Introduction to the Arts for beginning students. This is a divisional course presented by a staff representing the four departments of the Arts Division; Art, Dance, Drama, and Music. Victor E. Jacoby, chairman of the Arts Division, serves as chairman of the course and covers the Drama unit. Approximately 100 students are registered for the course each term.

Despite Adelphi College's proximity to New York City and the center of local art activity, it is surprising how large a portion of the students has never been to a legitimate Broadway play, seen a ballet or opera, or have any real acquaintance with the outstanding art exhibits. Accordingly one of the requirements of the course is that each student experience at least one major event in each area.

The large student group is divided into four sections that rotate on a quarterly basis to each representative faculty member for classroom lecture and discussion in each field. These units are interspersed with general meetings of the entire class at which time a demonstration in one of the arts fields is usually presented and discussed.

This term an attempt was made to integrate the material in the demonstration by focussing the interest on a common factor in several of the arts. For example, one such lecture-demonstration dealt with the principle of *emphasis* as achieved in the different art media. Slides representing a diversity of styles of painting in which various techniques had been used were shown, a demonstration of the stage director's method of achieving emphasis through focus, levels, contrast, etc. was presented on stage, and an advanced group of dance majors demonstrated the principles as applied in simple dance form.

---

MORE THAN 500 HIGH SCHOOL and college speech students and their instructors will arrive in Denver for the 24th annual presentation of the University of Denver's Rocky Mountain Speech conference to be held in two divisions from February 11 through 19 on the University Park Campus. The conference will provide discussion in the clinical aspects of speech correction as well as extensive forensic activities, according to Earl E. Bradley, chairman of the meet.

The conference is divided into a high school division to meet on February 11-12 and the college and clinical division meeting from February 17 through 19. Tom Rousse, president of the Speech Association of America and conference guest of honor, will address the general session at a banquet on February 18 on the conference theme, "Communication in Times of Crises."

College and high school students representing over 30 colleges and 25 high schools will compete in speaking programs in their own divisions including debate, discussion, extemporaneous speaking, oratory and interpretation. Certificates will go to individuals rated tops in the high school class with a plaque for "excellence in participation" going to the school with the highest overall standing.

Elwood Murray, nationally known head of the DU School of Speech and originator of the speech conference 24 years ago, said delegates will have to be fast-moving as well as fast talking. Ativities of the conference will be held in more than thirty rooms in various University Park campus buildings during the two sessions.

Some of the subjects and areas to be covered are business and professional speaking, headed by George Vardaman; oral reading and interpretation, Johnnye Akin; speech and hearing disorders, Warren J. and Ruth Clark; clinical reading, Keith Case, and interpersonal communication, Dr. Murray. Thorrel B. Fest and Milton Valentine of the University of Colorado will head the group action and research in speech disorders departments respectively.

---

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON the graduate faculty has recently approved a program leading to the doctorate in speech. This marks the climax of several years' development during which the study and research facilities of the Department of Speech have grown to include a total of 50 courses of which approximately 30 are included in the advanced and graduate program. Facilities include a well equipped speech and hearing clinic, experimental phonetics laboratory, speech communication laboratory for study of social aspects of speech, and a radio speech studio. The activities of the department include workshops in public discussion and oral interpretation of literature, plus a program in teacher training in cooperation with the College of Education. The full-time resident staff of the department consists of 23 members.

---

THE PLAYSHOP of the Johns Hopkins University is making its contribution to International The-

atre Month with a lecture, March 14, on "Twentieth Century Spanish Drama" by N. Bruce Wardropper, chairman of the Department of Romance Languages at the University. The lecture will be followed by scenes from a full-length play or a one-act play by a Spanish playwright.

Two other European playwrights are being given recognition. On January 17, N. Bryllion Fagin, Director of the Playshop, discussed the influence of Anton Chekhov. The final offering of the season will be a production of Jacinto Benavente's "Bonds of Interest" beginning on April 19.

---

THE READERS WORKSHOP of the Department of Speech of the University of Washington continues its activities as in former years by presenting on campus a series of six Sunday evening readings of outstanding literary masterpieces, as follows: The *Antigone* of Sophocles, *Under Milk Wood* by Dylan Thomas, *Fiorenza* by Thomas Mann, *Julia Domna* and *Long Ago* by Michael Field, *The Mystery of the Redemption*, and *The High Bid* by Henry James. In addition, the Workshop presents these and other programs before large numbers of community audiences; and under sponsorship of the University's Office of Lectures and Concerts, is presenting programs at the University of British Columbia and other universities in the Pacific Northwest. Bernard Goldstein is Director of the Workshop.

---

APPOINTMENTS

Brooklyn College: Leland H. Watson, instructor in speech.

University of Georgia: Harold Luper, assistant professor of speech correction.

University of Hawaii: Second semester, Wesley Wiksell; summer session, Bower Aly.

University of Mississippi: Robert F. Marsden, instructor in speech, technical director of theatre; Beverly Primeaux, graduate fellow in speech; Elizabeth Beliles, teaching assistant in speech; Paul Bacarro, graduate assistant in speech and hearing; Ernest Payne, graduate assistant in debate; Nelson Carpenter, graduate assistant in theatre.

University of New Hampshire: Edward D. Shanken, assistant director of the University Extension Service and instructor in speech.

University of North Dakota: Jay Melrose, assistant professor of speech and director of the speech clinic; Dean Engel, graduate assistant in speech.

University of Virginia: James S. Helms, director, Bureau of School and Community Drama.

Wayne University: J. Daniel Logan, radio-television; Quinn T. Millar, television program production; Richard D. Spear, instructor in speech.

---

PROMOTIONS

Catholic University of America: John T. Dugan, associate professor of speech and drama.

University of North Dakota: Andrew J. Kochman, Jr., associate professor of speech; John S. Penn, professor of speech.

University of Omaha: Bruce A. Linton, associate professor of speech and dramatic arts.

Wayne University: Jack P. Clark, associate professor of speech.

---

THEATRE SCHEDULE

Adelphi College: *The Heiress, Liliom, Measure for Measure, The Dragon.*

Catholic University of America: *Richard III, The Playboy of the Western World, The Comedian.*

Children's Educational Theatre of Maryland: *The Christmas Package: Santa's Spectacles, The Christmas Clowns; Indian Captive, The Wizard of Oz.*

Long Island University: *Rocket to the Moon, Heartbreak House, A Scrap of Paper.*

University of Michigan: *The Foolish One, A Connecticut Comedy, Careless Wilderness* (original plays); *Falstaff.*

University of Mississippi: *The Cocktail Party, First Lady, The Second Man, Twelfth Night.*

University of Oregon: *Hannele; Captive at Large, The Contrast, Arthur.*

University of Virginia: *Stalag 17, The Crucible, Twelfth Night.*

Yale University: *At the Seventh Hour.*

---

PERSONAL NOTES

During the past summer Charles M. Getchell, chairman of the Department of Speech at Mississippi, served as visiting professor of Speech and Theatre at the University of Maine. In addition to his teaching duties, Professor Getchell conducted several tours to summer theatres in the New England area. . . . Joseph Baldwin received a grant from the University of Mississippi Liberal Arts Development Fund to write a symphonic-drama on Mississippi his-